[Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai.]

to be dealt with. It is better to leave the matter alone, until another Bench holds that the High Court has no such power. I may assure the members who expressed their views with reference to the Bill that every one of their suggestions will be considered by the Select Committee, and I believe they also know that, unless I have the support of the members on the other side, the Bill will not be passed. Therefore, there is no fear that the Bill will be passed over their heads. Every suggestion made by the members will, I repeat, receive careful consideration at the hands of the Select Committee. I dare say that some of them who have expressed their views will have no objection to sit on the Select Committee.

Mr. Subba Aiyar's motion was then put to the vote and carried.

The Secretary then read the title of the Bill.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: I beg to move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee to report in three months.

MR. K. GEORGE: I second it.

The motion was carried.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: I beg to propose the names of the following gentlemen to be members of the Select Committee, *viz.*, Rao Bahadur K. A. Krishna Aiyangar, Mr. S. Krishna Iyer, Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai, Mr. Changanachery K. Paramesvaran Pillai, Mr. Joseph Panjikaran, Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, Mr. C. P. Kochukunju Pillai, Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai, and myself.

The Council accepted the proposal, the members having agreed.

RESOLUTION *RE* KALLAR HYDRO-ELECTRIC SCHEME.

PRESIDENT: Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai will now move the Resolution standing in his name.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution:

(*a*)" That this Council recommends to Government (*a*) that, in regard to the Kallar Hydro-Electric Scheme now under the consideration of Government, no assurance should be held out to Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. that they will be granted such permission, facilities and concessions as have been prayed for by them to construct and carry out the scheme until Government have had an opportunity of examining the report of any preliminary investigation that the Company may be permitted to undertake in this behalf and of ascertaining in what way and to what extent the State stood to benefit by the said project;

(*b*) That a Committee of experts be appointed to investigate the possibility of Kallar water being made use of for irrigational and other purposes in Travancore and as to how the proposed diversion of Kallar water and the generation of power in the Madura District will affect the interests of Travancore; and

(*c*) That the said Committee be directed to recommend the terms and conditions under which the investigation of the Kallar Hydro-Electric Scheme should, if at all, be entrusted to Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co."

Sir, my Resolution involves three parts and raises three main questions and a few subsidiary questions of importance. The first question is that no assurance should be held out to the Company that they

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

will be granted the permission, facilities and concessions asked for, until after we have had an opportunity of examining the preliminary report and ascertaining in what way and to what extent the State stood to benefit by the said project.

Now, the history of this scheme ranges over a fairly large period and covers several stages. If I were to set them out in detail, the time allotted to me under the rules would be exceeded before I go into the merits of my Resolution. I am, however, glad that my task in this respect has been rendered easy to some extent by the publication of a Press Communiqué on the subject a couple of days ago and of certain printed papers which were placed in our hands last afternoon. Perhaps I need not have referred to any other facts or correspondence in detail, if the said Press Communiqué or the printed papers had been in our (non-official) hands a little earlier. Still, since my time is rather limited, I should like myself not to enter into those details, except to the extent that may become necessary to support the arguments advanced in favour of the Resolution. If, however, it is found that, in dealing with this subject of importance covering a vast field, I should exceed my time, I might, at the outset, request the President to be indulgent towards me and allow five or ten minutes more than the time ordinarily allowed to the mover of a Resolution. I wish to confine myself only to the very salient features of the subject.

PRESIDENT: I regret I am unable to allow you to exceed the time.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Of course, I will confine my remarks within the 20 minutes allowed to me. The first part of the Resolution, as I have already submitted, is that the terms and concessions should be looked into and the benefit of the said project ascertained before Government committed themselves one way or the other. This is not a recommendation made for the first time by me. Mr. Barrow and Mr. Jacob, the late Chief Engineer, also expressed the same view in their letters which are published in the printed papers supplied to us (*vide* pages 9, 15 and 19). Mr. Barrow wrote:

"Government cannot hold out any assurance that they (the Company) will be granted such permission and facilities as may be necessary to enable them to construct and carry out the scheme, until Government have had an opportunity of studying their report and have learnt in what way Travancore can be benefited by the introduction, if it is possible, of electric power into Travancore."

Take page 15, wherein Mr. Jacob, who has latterly been very enthusiastic about the scheme, said:

"I do not think Government should bind themselves at the present stage to grant any concession or to carry out the scheme until they have the full results of the investigation financially and otherwise, and Messrs. Alfred Dickinsons' final report before them."

And at page 19 he says:

"I would prefer to say that, while the Government are willing to favourably consider the proposal (in the event of Government deciding not to proceed with the scheme themselves) of giving Messrs. Alfred Dickinson and Co. *an option of a concession*, they are not prepared to commit themselves so far at this stage."

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. G. Parameswaran Pillai.]

This then represents the view of the experts themselves regarding concessions and facilities being awarded even before any investigation is conducted. Why is this preliminary investigation rendered necessary before settling the terms of the concession regarding the construction of the scheme?

I was under the impression until the Press Communiqué was issued a couple of days ago, that the necessity for a preliminary investigation and report before the settlement of the terms had been generally accepted by the Government themselves; and under what conditions this investigation should be allowed to be undertaken by the firm seems to have been referred to a conference of the Economic Development Board. Subsequently, however, we find from the Press Communiqué that no question of investigation does arise. Now, according to Government it does not matter whether any investigation is made or not. They say:

"Recognition of the fact that the State will not be in a position for a long time to come to finance the scheme and execute it as a State concern, makes it unnecessary to consider the question of investigation and the fee payable therefor." (Press Communiqué, paragaph 14.)

I hope that from the printed papers supplied to us it will be clear to this House that between 1909 and 1916 the Kallar Scheme, otherwise known as the Cardamom Hills Project, has been the subject of negotiations between the Madras Government and the Travancore Government in one form or other. I would now refer this House to the previous correspondence on the subject which will show why a preliminary investigation is absolutely essential before the final settlement of the terms. This is what Sir (then Mr.) P. Rajagopalachari wrote in answer to a reference from the Madras Government for making a preliminary investigation of the Kallar Scheme. He wrote thus in 1909:

"But I beg to state in advance that the carrying out of the project itself – throwing a masonry dam across the Kallar, one of the tributaries of the Periyar river, to impound the water over a catchment area of 70 square miles approximately for diverting it into British territory for the irrigation of about 20,000 acres, – will, in the opinion of the Darbar, be detrimental to its interests, for the following reasons:

(1) The southern limit of the catchment area of the proposed reservoir is the northern limit of that of the Periyar lake. The Kallar valley and the lower slopes contain deciduous forest with teak and other species of valuable timber. A good deal of this deciduous forest, above the proposed dam, will disappear by submergence and will thus be practically lost for forest working.

(2) If the forest in the catchment area of the proposed reservoir is to be strictly conserved for preservation of water in the Kallar, its working for exploitation of timber will have probably to be considerably reduced – may even have to be limited to the extraction of only dead and dying trees – the Darbar thereby losing the benefit of the full productive capacity of the forest that falls within the catchment area.

(3) By the diversion of the water by the existing Periyar dam there has been already a substantial decrease of water in the Periyar river, and if a further diversion of water from the Periyar basin is effected, the difficulties of navigation in the Periyar river will be increased: the salt water from the backwaters will come up higher and higher, to the injury of cultivation in the Travancore and Cochin States.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(4) There are large areas in Travancore – and also in Cochin – which depend for their fertility on the annual inundation by the waters of the Periyar river and these lands will be adversely affected by any further diminution of the flood water.

(5) It is believed that the water proposed to be diverted could be advantageously used for irrigation in Travancore itself ; for, though the upper basin of the Periyar river is *at present* undeveloped, there may come a time when it will be occupied and when the water may be required.

3. I mention all these points now, so that the Madras Government may take them into consideration before sanctioning expenditure on an investigation in regard to a project to the execution of which, the Darbar, in its own interests, may not see its way to agree."

The next correspondence that appears from the printed papers is a letter from the Resident dated the 8th October, 1914, when the present project, not only for the purpose of irrigation but also for the development of power with a view to the manufacture of valuable manures, was put forward by the Madras Government. In forwarding that letter, the Madras Government also took care to explain away the objections that were once raised by Sir P. Rajagopalachari. On the receipt of that letter, this Government replied thus:

"3. The Darbar have given their most careful and anxious consideration to the whole matter and they regret very much that they are unable to accept the arguments contained in the Note by the Irrigation Engineer, in answer to the objections advanced by Mr. Rajagopalachari. On the contrary, the Darbar would urge the following additional grounds to show that the proposed scheme is highly detrimental to the true interests of Travancore.

(1) There is not much of good forest available in the High Range Division. The southern portion of this Division is taken up by the catchment area of the Periyar lake where about 245 square miles are yielding no revenue to the Darbar. The northern portion is occupied by the Kannan Devan Hills Produce Company's concession, while the areas in the centre are set apart for cardamom cultivation. The only bit of forest worth the name is near Aiyappencoil. This area is being denuded rapidly and the supply of timber cannot be expected to last long. If the Kallar Valley also is leased out as now desired by your Government, there will practically be no appreciable Forest revenue obtainable from this Division. Further, it is reported that the cart road by which the timber from the felling area is now removed to the Ramakal Depôt runs through the valley of the Kallar, and that, if the dam is constructed, more than 9 miles of the road will be under water. Owing to the nature of the country, it is impossible to open another road and, unless transport of timber is effected by boats, which would be very costly, the main supply of timber from Aiyappencoil will have to be diverted to the Kumili Depôt alone, instead of to the Ramakal Depôt, in which latter case the State Forest revenue would be considerably affected. Thus the proposed scheme, if carried out, would result in loss to the Darbar's forest revenue to a considerable extent.

(2) The Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras, suggests that the timber in the water-spread area could be taken over at a valuation. But this could be done only in respect of the trees that are *now* on the land. Once the area is leased out to the British Government, the recurring income therefrom will be completely lost. The lease of the land to the British Government is quite on a different footing from registry of the same in favour of cultivators. In the former case, it is practically a case of cession of territory. In the case of all registered holdings, the Darbar have the right to revise the assessment once in 30 years, which they cannot do in the case of lands leased out to your Government.

(3) With regard to the Madras Irrigation Chief Engineer's remarks that there will be no injury to navigation and cultivation in Travancore by the proposed diversion of water from the Kallar as there will be no appreciable diminution of the water-flow, I have to state that, *without greatly diminishing the water-flow in the river, no water can be*

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[MR. G. Paramesvaran Pillai.]

turned from it into British territory. There will also be diminution of silt on which the punja cultivation of the plains of Travancore so greatly depends. The tapping of the head sources of the Travancore rivers will have a far-reaching prejudicial effect on Travancore punja cultivation and navigation highways, so essential to this State. There is the further fact that, when the time comes for this Darbar to develop the resources of the State to enhance the material prosperity of its people, the Darbar will find that other agencies have already tapped all such resources, in return for a very small royalty.

(4) The Darbar feel that the natural resources of the Periyar river should be retained for irrigations works or industrial purposes, which may have to be undertaken or developed hereafter in the State. The Darbar do not consider it sound policy to allow these sources to be tapped and utilised for the immediate benefit of the neighbouring British Districts, leaving it to Travancore to obtain, as a concession from the British Government, the water or power that the State may need in the future. On the other hand, this State should, it is submitted, have the first use of these resources for its own development, industrial or otherwise, the surplus, if any, being granted to the neighbouring British District.

(5) There is a proposal to bring under cultivation all the grass lands and swamps that are now lying waste in the Cardamom Hills, the grass lands for tea and the swamps for paddy. The area now asked for could be well utilised for the above purpose which would bring in a substantial addition to the State revenue besides increasing the material prosperity of the people. If the area now proposed is leased out to the British Government for the project, not only will this State lose a considerable revenue on that area, but there will be further loss of revenue on several of the existing cardamom lands which will be submerged, if the project is carried out. There is also the chance of the Travancore Darbar not getting any revenue from any portion of the catchment area of 73 and odd square miles. For the British Government are now objecting to the registry of lands lying within the Periyar catchment area for cardamom cultivation and they are likely to put forward similar objection in respect of the proposed Kallar catchment area also. The State will thus lose its legitimate revenue on more than *300 square miles* of its territory and it need hardly be submitted that it is a considerable sacrifice for a State like Travancore to make.

4. Thus, in every way, Travancore will be a loser, if the proposed project is carried out by the British Government. The Darbar feel strongly that in consenting to the proposed lease of more land within the State boundaries, they will not act in the best interests of the country. The Darbar will be in a position to undertake such projects and the carrying out of such schemes by this State itself would enable it not only to supply electric power to the several factories in the State, but also outside the State on favourable terms. I am, therefore, to request that you will be so good as to lay before the Madras Government the wishes of the Darbar in regard to the withdrawal of the proposed project. I would respectfully urge that the views of the Darbar may be met in a sympathetic spirit, considering the interests involved and the responsibilty of the administration in conserving the resources of the State."

It has to be remembered that the Company also insisted upon the Reserve Forest being maintained as such without the ryots being allowed to carry on any further cultivation within the area.

The British Government again sent another letter explaining away the objections and quoting certain figures in relation to rainfall and the quantity of reduction in the flow of water that was apprehended by the Travancore Government, if the project were to be carried out.

It was then urged that the rainfall in the catchment area was only 73 inches, that the total reduction of water would, in consequence, only be 4 per cent., and that, after all, it was not going to affect the interests of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

cultivation or irrigation or any other purpose that we might find it necessary to put this water to. That was a very lengthy letter. The Madras Government wrote thus:

"It will thus be seen that the carrying out of the project will not only not impede but will materially facilitate the development of the catchment area and the exploitation of forest produce not actually in the submerged area. In regard to this latter, the steady annual revenue which would accrue under the proposed lease would result in a much greater income from this area than can be anticipated by any other means. It is believed that the prosecution of the project would be advantageous to both States and, in view of the further explanation given above, my Government trust that the Darbar will be able to withdraw their opposition to the proposals."

That was in 1916. Again the question seems to have engaged the serious attention of Government and this is the final outcome. Mr. Bastow wrote on the 16th September, 1916, as follows:

"4. Now in discussing the scheme I would deprecate the kind of discussion it has had up to the present; the time has not yet come to go into details. The point that strikes one on reading the letters of the Madras Government is that they have entirely ignored the effect of their project on the population and wealth of the people of Travancore and on the development thereof and have tried to narrow down the discussion to the miserable limits of the land tax which the Sirkar may hope to get. This is a big question affecting the alienation *for all time* of State rights, *i. e.*, the rights and property of the present and prospective people of Travancore. It involves the surrender of water for irrigation, of water-power, and the cession for all practical purposes of a large area of land, and these are the matters to which we must now direct our attention.

5. As regards the water, the Travancore and Cochin ryots are at present mainly concerned with flood water on the silt from which the fertility of their fields depends. It is urged that there is plenty of flood water. That is not the way to look at it. It is the height of the flood that counts and it is poor consolation to a ryot to know that there is plenty of water in the river, if the flood falls short of his field by an inch or so. As a matter of fact the amount already withdrawn by the Periyar Scheme is enormous and the further decrease now contemplated is no small matter.

6. The reduction in the ordinary river flow has also to be seriously considered. It affects navigation and, what is more serious, it affects the freshness of the water up to and beyond Alwaye. As the upland flow diminishes in the hot weather, so does the salt water work further up-stream. As regards future irrigation development, it is obvious that, with our population growing by 16 per cent. and our revenue by 50 per cent. in every decade, irrigation development in the Periyar valley is certain. We have absolutely no justification for saying that we can spare any water at all. It is easy to poohpooh these objections and to say that they are nothing. They are real; they affect an enormous number of people now and, if the water is withdrawn, all future generations will be the poorer thereby."

Then he set out in detail how the scheme was highly detrimental to the interests of Travancore. Thereupon the reply of the Darbar to the Madras Government was as follows:

"I have the honor to inform you that the Darbar have again very carefully considered their objections in the light of those remarks, but they regret that the main objections to the scheme still hold good."

* * * * * * *

"From the further explanations set forth above, the Darbar believe that it will be seen that their objections already urged still hold good and that the carrying out of the scheme is detrimental to the interests of Travancore, even from the point of view of the mere revenue or income to be derived by the State which, by the way, is the only standpoint from which the question has been viewed by the Madras Government. The discussion of the scheme ought not, however, the Darbar consider, to be narrowed down to the revenue aspect. The consequences of the scheme are more far-reaching and vital.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. G. Parameśvaran Pillai.]

They affect the material prosperity of the people of Travancore. By granting the lands for agriculture, thousands of His Highness the Maha Raja's subjects will be benefited and the material condition of the people will be improved.

In conclusion, the Darbar regret that they are unable to share the belief of the Madras Government that the scheme would be advantageous to Travancore. They find that the disadvantages to Travancore by the carrying out of the scheme are so vital and so numerous and the advantages so few and nominal, that they regret that they cannot agree to it. The Darbar earnestly hope that, in the light of the further explanations above given, the Madras Government will withdraw from a project which will seriously affect the interests of Travancore and its people."

So then, three times this Government had to consider the explanations offered by the Madras Government and reject the same. I should now think that this House is satisfied from a perusal of the previous correspondence on the subject that after all it is not a very clear case that is put forward on the other side and that it does admit of some preliminary investigation being made to ascertain how far this scheme will benefit us. It has been declared three times by two successive administrations that the pushing on of this project would be absolutely detrimental to the interests of Travancore. In support of the contrary position, the British Government gave certain facts and figures in their letters already referred to. They were taken into consideration by the then Chief Engineer and the then Conservator of Forests. The objection regarding the loss of revenue from the forests and also the objection regarding the possibility of irrigational development being obstructed, seem to have been very carefully considered by them and those objections still held good. Mr. Jacob seems to have now got over all these in his hasty letter of the 5th December, 1921. This is hardly of any importance. I would refer you to the fact that the letter from the Chief Secretary to the Chief Engineer forwarding Mr. Bastow's objection for his opinion was dated the 1st December; and his reply came on the 5th, *i. e.*, within 4 days.

He meets Mr. Bastow's objections as follows. He says the reduction of water would be small, *i. e.*, not more than 6 per cent., and that the average rainfall from June to November comes to only 99·5 inches. But two years ago, *i. e.*, in September, 1919, when he investigated the several feasible projects of hydro-electric development within Travancore including these identical Kallar falls, he clearly and specifically stated that the rainfall of the catchment area in this place was between 200 to 300 inches. Mr. Bastow says that the rainfall is between 140 and 200 inches and that the percentage of reduction is much higher. But in 1921, the average rainfall is only 99·5 inches according to Mr. Jacob, and the percentage of reduction will only be 6 per cent. Now I leave it to the House to see whether they would accept Mr. Jacob's opinion as the final verdict. I do not want them to reject Mr. Jacob's proposal or to accept Mr. Bastow's as final. My only prayer is, as this scheme had been considered by two successive administrators and rejected as positively objectionable, please investigate the matter further before giving a final verdict in favour of the project. Let us

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

have some patience. Hurry in this matter will be most ill-advised. Please see that the subject is investigated; let us have the result of the investigations before the terms and conditions are settled. It is urged on the other side that we shall be getting cheap power and a proportion of the profits. I say, how do you decide or determine whether the power, when transmitted to Travancore, will be cheap enough for profitable use so as to create a good demand, or whether the power will be cheap when compared with the power obtainable from other sources of water-power within the State itself ?

These are questions of considerable importance and can be settled only after a preliminary investigation. What will be the cost per unit of power ? This evidently depends on the probable cost of construction. Before even ascertaining that, we are asked to accept one anna per unit. I may tell you that a difference of half a pie per unit will give a difference of Rs. 460 *per diem* for 10,000 H. P. Now, it is for this House to see whether the terms offered are reasonable or not. We cannot accept them as reasonable before we have sufficient data to come to a definite conclusion. Either way, I do not say that the scheme, as it is, should be abandoned. I say, please wait until the investigations are over. The Government themselves had once accepted this position on the recommendation of their own experts. (*Vide* page 9, printed papers.) Apart from the general suggestions contained in the Press Communiqué itself, where are the special reasons and fresh facts which justify a different course of action?

So far as the profits are concerned, we find that we have no definite idea as to the amount of revenue that is to be derived from the water that we shall be sending out. The rate at which power is proposed to be made available to Travancore depends on the payment for the water that the Madras Government is prepared to make. (See the A. B & C. Proposals referred to in the Press Communiqué.) With reference to the requisition of this Government to state the rate at which the Madras Government will pay for the water, this is what the Press Communiqué says:

"12. Coming to the resolutions of the Economic Development Board, it is observed (*vide* clause 3) that the Board recommends that the payment by the Madras Government to the Travancore Darbar for the water at the tail race should be fixed not according to the acreage irrigated but on the quantity of water discharged from the project, the rate being fixed by negotiation and made subject to periodical revision. This is a matter for negotiation between the Madras Government and the Travancore Darbar, the former having already agreed to the principle of payment, and this Government is confident that the amount and the manner of payment will be settled between the two Governments on a perfectly reasonable basis."

How are we to fix the terms and deem them reasonable when, as a matter of fact, even the rate for the water is an unknown quantity? If you grant certain terms to the Company before ascertaining the revenue derivable from the water sold, you will be taking a most unwise step. The Economic Development Board recommended that the payment for water should be assessed per quantity of water discharged at the tail race and the Company should be asked to pay by way of royalty per unit

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[MR. G. Paramesvaran Pillai.]

of power generated at the power house. The Board further stated that these could be settled only after investigation. The Press Communiqué evades the first point and does not accept the second. The reasons given for not accepting the second point, *viz.*, payment per unit of power generated, are not at all convincing, nor are they sustainable. The Press Communiqué says that to accept the suggestion of the Economic Development Board would act as a dead-weight on the enterprise. I should like that unfavourable conditions do act as a dead-weight on the Company rather than that they should prove ruinous to us.

We are not now in a position to know how we shall be affected when the project fully develops. So far as the cheap power and profits are concerned, it is imposible for us to come to a definite conclusion without a preliminary investigation. As to the advantages that are likely to accrue out of the working of this project, they are of a speculative character clouded in mystery, rather, in the mist of uncertainty. So far as the sacrifices are concerned, rightly or wrongly, they have been declared to be real and definite by two past administrations. I would just place it for the consideration of the House, whether it would support the proposal to enter into a contract with reference to the construction and carrying out of the Scheme before it is in a position to understand where it would be after the result of the investigation. I do not ask for more. It may be said that the Economic Development Board has considered these aspects. They have considered the question not with reference to the terms to be imposed in regard to the construction and carrying out of the scheme. They have considered the question of allowing the Company to investigate the matter and, if they are allowed to investigate the matter, on what conditions they may be allowed to do so. From the very nature of the conditions it will be seen that the Economic Development Board wanted to settle them after the preliminary investigation was over. Let us therefore wait until the investigation is over.

PRESIDENT: Your time is up. I must ask you to close.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I will close with this observation. So far as the terms and conditions are concerned, is not the result of the investigation essential in determining what terms and conditions will be beneficial to you? If the terms and conditions are to be moulded without even understanding the real situation, I am sure that we shall not be taking a very wise step. With a view to that being done, parts (*b*) and (*c*) are put in. I should like to know whether I have to deal with the Resolution as a whole, or separately, part by part.

PRESIDENT: As a whole.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: With reference to parts (*b*) and (*c*) I would say one word, namely, that an expert Committee should be appointed to investigate the possibilities of the Kallar water being made use of for irrigation within Travancore and the probable evil effects consequent upon the diversion of Kallar water outside Travancore.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Unfortunately, the original recommendations on this subject made by Mr. Bastow have been challenged. Then, I say, let some competent body investigate the matter. Let Mr. Everard or Dr. Kunjan Pillai do it. They have already declared their opinion on the matter. But they have not done so after independent personal investigation. They rely upon Mr. Jacob's letter above referred to. Have they ever personally investigated the matter? If not, I do think that an expert Committee ought to be appointed and let us not be satisfied with casual opinions made in certain quarters on certain occasions. With reference to clause (c) of my Resolution which refers to the terms and conditions of the investigation, if the Company is to be entrusted with the investigation at all, I am of opinion that the said Committee should be asked to consider the terms. Before I leave this Resolution, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the terms and conditions hitherto proposed are not satisfactory and that they deserve more careful looking into and that we can afford to wait until we know the result of the investigation and until we are in a position to know the real situation. I do not want this House to take a leap in the dark. I have much to add. Since the time is up, I am really sorry that all the contentions on my side cannot be urged.

PRESIDENT: I have given you 30 minutes.

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Sir, I beg to second the Resolution which has been just now moved by Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai. He has given very cogent and convincing reasons in support of the Resolution and it is hardly necessary for me to make a speech. I shall, however, make a few observations as the matter is of vital importance to the interests of the State. The only question before the House is whether it is not necessary to make further investigations into this Hydro-Electric Scheme before the Government finally enter into any definite agreement with Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. To my mind, it is a matter which will admit of very little doubt. The advantages claimed for this project by the Government in the Press Communiqué and in the other papers published on the subject are, (1) the possibility of getting cheap power for the development of industries, (2) opportunity for investing our capital, (3) the obtaining of a share in the profits of the Company, and (4) the securing of a price for water diverted into British territory for irrigation purposes. Let us examine these advantages more closely.

Cheap power. It is agreed on all hands that there is no facility at present for making any use of this power for industrial purposes. It was suggested that the supply might create a demand. It might or it might not and, on the off-chance of the supply producing the demand, we cannot enter into such a costly scheme. At any rate there is no immediate necessity for it.

Investment of capital. As far as I know, the difficulty in this country is not so much to find profitable investment for capital as to get sufficient capital to finance the existing industries of the country.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. Paramesvaran Pillai.]

There is no capital awaiting investment in the country and, at the present rate of interest obtaining in the country, it is extremely doubtful if anybody would care to invest his money in this doubtful and speculative concern.

Sharing the profits of the Company. The offer made by the Company is that, after paying 6 per cent. to debenture holders and preference share-holders and 10 per cent. to the ordinary share-holders, whatever may be left in the shape of profit will be divided between the Company and the Government in the proportion of two-thirds to one-third. At the time the matter was discussed at the meeting of the Development Board, the general consensus of opinion was that the Government are not likely to get anything by way of profit under these circumstances. It was, therefore, proposed by the Board that the Company must be asked to pay us a fixed price for every unit of electricity produced. It now appears from the Press Communiqué issued by the Government that the Government are not prepared to accept the recommendations of the Board on this matter, as, in their opinion, it will be unfair to the Company. In this matter, the Government appear to be more solicitous of the welfare of the Company than of the State. However, it is enough to say that, as the Government are not prepared to insist upon payment on the basis of the amount of the electricity produced, we are not likely to derive any profit from this business. It may, therefore, be said that the supposed advantages from the electrical scheme are purely illusory and speculative.

The impression left on my mind after reading the papers on the subject is that the electric scheme is merely a pretext. When the British Government started what is known as the Cardamom Hills Project and wanted the permission of this Government to put up a dam and to impound the water of the Kallar river for purposes of irrigation in British India they put forward also an electric scheme. It was said that they proposed to put up a power-house at a place called Kuruvanath for which they expected to use a portion of the Periyar water and they started the Cardamom Hills Project for the purpose of compensating for the loss of water that they sustained for irrigation purposes. The Resident in his letter (published in page 68 of the printed papers) says that it is not proposed to generate power from the Cardamom Hills but from the Periyar Lake at the foot of the Kumili ghaut. Even then Mr. Bastow said that there was no possibility of using any electric power in Travancore or British India, that the electric scheme was a secondary matter, and that what they really wanted was water for irrigation purposes to supplement the Periyar Project. The Cardamom Hills Project was objected to by Mr. Bastow. The Government agreed with him and refused to grant the permission sought by the British Government. As the Press Communiqué says, the British Government finally dropped the matter. The last correspondence on the matter is dated the 20th March, 1917. Nearly 18 months after this we find the scheme cropping up again in a different shape. I believe that during the interval—but I

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

am open to correction—Mr. Bastow retired and Mr. Jacob took his place. On the 23rd September, 1918, Mr. Jacob wrote to the Government for permission to make a general survey of the sources of hydro-electricity in the country. A few months after, he sent a communication to the Government mentioning the several sources in the country and pointing out the Kallar Falls as one of the most promising. On the 22nd September, 1919, Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. came forward with their proposal for the Kallar Electric Scheme. These facts speak for themselves. The Government eagerly took up the scheme, published a Press Communiqué on it and submitted the scheme for discussion at a conference of business men. What subsequently happened is well-known to the House. It has now been agreed that the power-house must be located in British territory and that the water should be diverted to British India. Luckily for us, the British Government have accepted the principle of payment. We may, therefore, as originally stated by Mr. Bastow, consider the electric scheme as a secondary matter and one from which no benefit can accrue to us. We may look upon it as the original Cardamom Hills Project in a different form.

Let us now examine what advantages we can derive from this project. This leads me to the fourth advantage claimed by Government, *viz.*, the price of water. The proposal of the Government is to pay at a particular rate per acre for the area that is irrigated by this water. The Development Board thought this not advantageous to the State and, therefore, recommended that—

"the payment by the Madras Government to the Travancore Darbar for the water at the tail race over which the (Travancore) Government shall have absolute rights of ownership, should be, not upon the acreage irrigated, but on the quantity of water discharged therefrom, the rate being fixed by negotiation and made subject to periodical revision."

But the Government are not prepared to accept this recommendation. They say in the Press Communiqué:

"Coming to the resolutions of the Economic Development Board, it is observed, (*vide* clause 3) that the Board recommends that the payment by the Madras Government to the Travancore Darbar for the water at the tail race should be fixed not according to the acreage irrigated but on the quantity of water discharged from the project, the rate being fixed by negotiation and made subject to periodical revision. This is a matter for negotiation between the Madras Government and the Travancore Darbar, the former having already agreed to the principle of payment, and this Government is confident that the amount and the manner of payment will be settled between the two Governments on a perfectly reasonable basis."

This might undoubtedly be done, if the contracting parties were on equal terms. I have got perfect confidence in the Travancore Government, and I believe, if it were possible for them, they would insist upon the most advantageous terms for us. We might expect the British Government also to be guided by considerations of what might be most advantageous to them. In such a state of affairs, if between two contracting parties one is in a position to dominate the other, it is clear as to who will get the greater benefit from the agreement. As to the respective positions of the two parties, I need only refer the House to the concluding portions of the letters of Dewan Mr. Krishnan Nair

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. Parameswaran Pillai.]

(published at pages 62 and 74 of the printed papers). The first letter concludes:

"I am, therefore, to request that you will be so good as to lay before the Madras Government the wishes of the Darbar in regard to the withdrawal of the proposed project. I would respectfully urge that the views of the Darbar may be met in a sympathetic spirit, considering the interests involved and the responsibility of the administration in conserving the resources of th State."

Note the words 'sympathetic spirit' in this letter. The other letter concludes:

"The Darbar earnestly hope that in the light of the further explanations above given, the Madras Government will withdraw from a project which will seriously affect the interests of Travancore and its people."

If the parties were in the same position and on terms of equality, it is difficult to understand why the Darbar should plead for sympathy in a matter of contract between two parties.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: Sir, I rise to a point of order. This does not arise.

PRESIDENT: I think it does arise.

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Sir, I think it is relevant. Thus we find that even from the water it is unlikely that we would get anything substantial.

PRESIDENT: May I point out that your time is up?

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Sir, I have got only one more word to say. I have endeavoured to point out that we are not likely to derive any substantial benefit from this scheme. Even if we are likely to gain anything, the question still arises as to how far that will compensate for the great losses pointed out by Mr. Bastow and the State is likely to sustain. This aspect of the question has not received that consideration which it deserves. The Madras Government endeavoured to meet the objections raised by Mr. Bastow and for this purpose they obtained their Chief Engineer's answer to Mr. Bastow's objections. The Madras Engineer's opinion was referred to Mr. Bastow again for his consideration. Mr. Bastow ably met the Madras Consulting Engineer's reply and the result was that the Travancore Government finally refused the permission asked for by the Madras Government. After the proposals of Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. came, the matter was referred by the Government to Mr. Jacob and the Development Board. Neither Mr. Jacob nor the Board made any independent investigation. Within four days of the reference by the Dewan, Mr. Jacob sent in his opinion supporting the scheme and, on a comparison of his letter with the Madras Engineer's letter referred to above, we will see that Mr. Jacob has merely reproduced the arguments of the Madras Chief Engineer. The Development Board considered it purely from an *a priori* standpoint and their opinion is contained in paragraph 9 of the minutes of the special meeting of the Board held on the 18th May, 1922. It is on the basis of the *ipse dixits* of Mr Jacob

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

and the majority of the members of the Development Board that the Government are now going to take this very serious step. I am, therefore, strongly of opinion that absolutely no case has been made out for reversing the decision of the Travancore Government refusing the permission asked for by the British Government and that the matter requires looking into.

MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR: Sir, my amendment is a simple one. In clause (*a*) in place of the word "Government", I want the word "Council" to be substituted, when the Resolution will run like this:

"That, in regard to the Kallar Hydro-Electric Scheme now under the consideration of Government, no assurance should be held out to Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co, that they will be granted such permission, facilities and concessions as have been prayed for by them to construct and carry out the scheme until the Council have had an opportunity of examining the report of any preliminary investigation that the Company may be permitted to undertake in this behalf and of ascertaining in what way and to what extent the State stood to benefit by the said project."

Clause (*b*) when amended will run like this:

"That the opinion of Sir M. Visvesvaraya be invited as to the possibility of Kallar water being made use of for irrigational and other purposes in Travancore and as to how the proposed diversion of Kallar water and the generation of power in the Madura District will affect the interests of Travancore." and

Clause (*c*) when amended, will run like this:

"That the opinion of Sir. M. Visvesvaraya be invited in regard to the terms and conditions under which the investigation of the Kallar Hydro-Electric Scheme should, if at all, be entrusted to Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co."

In inviting the opinion of an expert, I want to make pointed reference to the reports of the experts we already have. Mr. Bastow tells us that, if the scheme is carried through, it will be detrimental to the interests of future generations. Mr. Jacob, an equally competent engineer, opines that the scheme, if carried through, will confer lasting benefits on the people. When doctors differ like this, one almost loses faith in the opinion of experts, or at least the sort of experts that have dealt with the subject. With reference to Mr. Jacob's opinion I would invite the opinion of the House to the letter of the Government calling for his expert opinion. This letter is printed at page 38 of the important papers connected with the Kallar-Hydro Electric Scheme. The House will see that Mr. Jacob is called upon to meet the opinions of Mr. Bastow as detailed therein. In legal parlance, this is called a leading question and it has had the necessary effect of inducing the desired opinion. On the second occasion when the Government wanted some sort of expert opinion, it addressed the Economic Development Board. Here again the Government has expressed its opinion and calls for confirmation. An opinion secured under such circumstances would not carry much weight, at any rate, before a court of law. On the third occasion, Government pursued the same tactics. When issuing the last Press Communiqué Government expresses its decision and then leaves

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

the matter for discussion in this House. Under these circumstances one cannot see that further expert opinion of the kind would be of any advantage. It is, therefore, that in my amendment I invoke the independent opinion of an independent expert, possibly the best authority on the subject in this part of India. The mover has given you the history of the scheme, and told you how, in 1909, the Madras Government made the first move for purposes of irrigation. I will call it an irrigation move. In the second instance, the Madras Government made another move for hydro-electric purposes. This move I will call a hydro-electric move. The present move is better engineered and comes through scientific experts. I will call this an electric move. This is an attempt to drive us at electric speed. What we object to is the hurry with which the whole scheme is attempted to be rushed through. I recommend to the House a further investigation at the hands of the best expert available in this part of India before a leap is taken.

MR. N. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, I beg to second the amendment.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar will be the official member in charge of this subject.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: Sir, with great deference to the learned gentleman who has moved the amendment just now, I am under the necessity of opposing it. In doing so, I wish to point out that we have an advantage in this House that Mr. Krishna Aiyar has not possibly counted on. Throughout his argument, Mr. Krishna Aiyar has laid stress on the circumstance that the various points to which he has drawn prominent attention are such as would make a court of law decide against the Government, if the Government were to go before such a court in this matter. The advantage that I refer to as on our side in this House is this. Mr. Krishna Aiyar's argument might indeed carry some weight in a lay assembly, where his recognised eminence as a lawyer and his assertion as to what *lawyers* might do in the matter would naturally deflect judgment a great deal. It cannot do so in *this* House. For, in this assembly, over 50 per cent. of the members are men who are either practising lawyers or are persons who administer law in the course of their daily work in life. This House, I am sure, will know what precise weight it should attach to Mr. Krishna Aiyar's pleas of the Government having put leading questions to Mr. Jacob, and of having hustled him into giving just the answer that was required by the Government. Mr. Krishna Aiyar has just told us that, where doctors differ, he loses all faith in them. I presume that the point of his observation is aimed against differences among engineers as well. If this be so, why should he now come forward and suggest, for the solution of the difficulty, the intervention of another engineer, namely, Sir. M. Visvesvaraya? In what capacity is this eminent gentleman's intervention suggested except in that of the great engineer he is? It must be confessed that, in Mr. Krishna Aiyar's argument, it is hard to find anything like consistency.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

To turn to another point. In pressing his amendment, Mr. Krishna Aiyar has adumbrated on the Government's *asking* Mr. Jacob to *meet* Mr. Bastow's argument in regard to the utilisation of the Kallar water. He appeared to suggest that this was in the nature of another leading question, such as a court of law would *not* have allowed. Is it possible that it is not known to Mr. Krishna Aiyar,—as I am sure it *is* known to every one in this House, official or non-official,—that the procedure in official correspondence goes in this way, *viz.*, that very often important questions have been considered for a long time, and the opinions of the individual officers concerned are formed and are made informally known to their superiors and to the Head of the Administration, and are even occasionally made the subject of semi-informal correspondence, before a requisition is made for the *formal* confirmation, by the officers concerned, of the opinions or decisions which they might previously have communicated informally?

MR. S KRISHNA AIYAR: I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

PRESIDENT: Mr. Krishna Aiyar wants the permission of the House to withdraw his amendment. Does the House grant it?

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: Does Mr. Krishna Aiyar withdraw *all* his amendments?

MR S. KRISHNA AIYAR: I propose to withdraw the second and third parts of my amendment only.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I beg to accept the remaining amendment, with reference to clause (*a*) of the Resolution.

PRESIDENT: I take it that the House accepts the withdrawal. It seems to me that no distinct advantage is to be gained by discussing the amendment and the substantive Resolution separately, especially as Mr. Krishna Aiyar has now withdrawn clauses (*b*) and (*c*) of his amendment, and as the withdrawal has been accepted by the House. Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar may now speak about the portion of the amendment that remains and the Resolution.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: I thought of speaking on the main Resolution only after I had the opportunity of hearing gentlemen on the other side of the House. I was under the impression that, as in other assemblies, the amendments and the main Resolution could be spoken on separately. I have been speaking on the amendments, and one of them still remains. In the middle of my remarks, the question is taken up as to whether the amendment and the proposition should not be discussed together. I submit that this is a disadvantage to me. I would ask leave only to say one or two words on the part of the amendment that remains, and sit down, and then resume, at a later stage, my remarks on the main proposition, as I had intended. It would assuredly be to the advantage of the House that I should do so only after hearing some more members on the other side.

MR. S. PARAMESVARA AIYAR: I rise, Sir, to a point of order. I beg to enquire whether the member in charge of the subject on this

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

side of the House can speak twice, in addition to exercising his final right of reply.

MR. L. C. HODGSON: May I also rise to a point of order, Sir? Is withdrawing a portion of an amendment in order?

PRESIDENT: It is in order, since the House has accepted it.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: I was distinctly permitted to speak only on the amendment, and I was speaking on it when I was interrupted. It has now been decided by the President that the amendment and the Resolution should be discussed together, once for all. May I submit that, in equity, I should be allowed to speak again on the main Resolution? When I began to speak on the amendment, I had no idea that thereby I had either to lose my subsequent right of speech on the main Resolution, or that I should speak on the latter at an earlier stage than I had contemplated.

PRESIDENT: I am sorry that I have interrupted the official member in charge of the motion while speaking on the amendment. However, as I have ruled that the amendment as well as the substantive motion should be discussed together, he will be given 30 minutes, the time actually taken by Mr. G. Parameswaran Pillai to speak on the Resolution.

The Council may now adjourn for lunch and re-assemble at 2-45 P. M.

The Council having re-assembled at Two forty-five of the Clock, the discussion on the Resolution was resumed.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: Sir, you have already called upon the official member in charge to speak. Under Standing Order No. 23, I submit that he cannot speak on the motion hereafter, unless he does so now.

PRESIDENT: Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar, will you please speak now?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: As I submitted already to you, Mr. President, I should have preferred speaking on the motion after I had the advantage of listening to some more gentlemen on both sides of the House. That would undoubtedly have been convenient to the House, as it would have been to the Government, which has asked me to act as spokesman on this occasion. However, in deference to your wish, Sir, as well as in view of possibly helping to prevent some straying away from the real issues involved in the question under consideration, I shall speak now, and restrict myself to some *general* matters on which I feel I *should* speak, from the nature of some of the remarks which have already been made by previous speakers.

If I may do so, Sir, I should like to say, at the very outset, that in a sense, it is a matter for general satisfaction that at the very inception of this reformed Council, the first question to be taken up should be one

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

of such public importance. The House has now the opportunity to decide—and, perhaps, decide once for all—on a most important question of economic policy. The decision that will be arrived at this afternoon is bound to have the most momentous consequences on the future of the State. The decision of the House to-day will not be an ineffective and colorless pronouncement on a mere academic discussion.

Before entering on the main issues of the question, I would ask the indulgence of the House to refer to one minor matter, namely, the complaint which has been made, or suggested, in the course of the discussion to-day, that the Government had *not* taken the public fully into their confidence in this matter; and that it has already been prejudged by the Government, before the issue of the Communiqué only two or three days back. It is not necessary for me to say much to show the utter untenableness of such charges. Need I remind members that they have had ample evidence before them, during the present administration, of its constant desire to provide for all due publicity, and of the utter absence of any desire or even disposition to go on with its policies, without first taking into its confidence the people of the State or their representatives? The manner in which, during the present administration, Press Communiquè has followed close on the heels of Press Communiqué when important questions were under consideration, the throwing open of the discussions of the Development Board to the press and to the public, and the readiness, manifested in different ways, to impart information on matters of public interest when such information was sought, and even when it was not specifically asked for,—these, I confidently submit to the House, must convince even the most determined critics of the administration that it has had no desire to work in the dark, and that it has had no wish to pursue a line of conduct or policy which the representatives of the people do not want it to follow. I would emphatically make this claim, particularly in regard to the Kallar Hydro-Electric Scheme, about which Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai has moved his Resolution with, if I may say so, characteristic ability and force. The papers that have been printed and placed before the members have been collected and submitted to the House as early as it was possible to do so, after the Resolution had been notified on the subject. And I may add that, barring those on this side of the House who have had to deal with the matter officially, the others, *including myself*, have not had earlier access to these documents than gentlemen on the other side.

There is one other point to which I might invite pointed attention, in view of the trend the discussion has been taking or is liable to take. It is this. In this very important question, the interests of the Government and of the members of the House, are *not*, and *cannot* be, divergent. We are equally interested. We may see the question from different points of view, arrive at different conclusions, and derive from the perusal of the papers to which we have all had equal access given, very different conclusions. It may be that some members, on either side of the House, may have had the opportunity to acquire more personal knowledge of the question or some of its aspects. For instance, members

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

who, like the mover of the Resolution now under discussion, have been on the Economic Development Board from the time when this matter was engaging its attention, have had not only the advantage of having heard all the discussions in the Board, but of meeting experts like Mr. Richards. Such an advantage I do not possess. But, even from the perusal of the printed proceedings of the Board and its discussions, and the other papers given to us by the Government, it appears to me that a case *has* been very clearly made out for such *immediate* action being taken, as it is the purpose of the Resolution to prevent. Speaking for myself, my surprise has been that, with such full knowledge of the matter, Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai should have taken up a position which is virtually one of opposition to the Scheme. I use the words "opposition to the scheme" deliberately, because it is impossible to discover a reason, a justification, for the motion, unless the latter is to be regarded as a delaying, or blocking motion. (A cry 'No'.) I repeat, "delaying, or blocking motion," because, to my mind, a study of the question shows how inexpedient all delay in the matter will hereafter be, and how it will amount to the dropping of the Scheme itself. We are apt to think otherwise and to say that a *little* delay is advantageous, and in any case can't be harmful, because so much has been said by previous speakers on "rushing" this Scheme through. May I beg you, in this connection, to look into the papers before you and recognise that in regard at least to one important branch of this question, *viz.*, the irrigational aspect of it, the matter is really old, and so old, that were we to delay, as we are adjured to do and have been doing, we may have the chance of celebrating the first jubilee of its inception?

In regard to the *technical* aspects of the question under investigation, I shall leave them to the expert friends on my side of the House—the Chief Engineer, the Director of Agriculture and the Conservator of Forests. There are, however, two or three points of *a general* character which have been so used in the debate against us that I feel justified in referring to them *now*.

Firstly, so much has been said about Mr. Bastow's opinions on the older scheme, the Cardamom Hills Reservoir Scheme, which has now been given up, and of his having been adverse to a scheme like the one now proposed. Is that really so? Mr. Bastow was unwilling, when the original proposal gave place to a Hydro-Electric Power Scheme to be developed near the Periyar reservoir, to agree to it, because he felt that the time would come when this State will require to raise power from the Kallar, and that, when that time did come, *we* must have the chance of running it. Is this opposition to a Scheme like the present, which, I submit, is *precisely* what Mr. Bastow perhaps had in mind for the State? If it be said that it was open to Mr. Bastow to have more explicitly proposed the present Scheme itself in its essential features, I should like to point out how recent, relatively

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

speaking, are Hydro-Electric Schemes in India, and how they had not, in Mr. Bastow's days, either the vogue or the general appreciation and popularity in India, which they have since attained. Members may be reminded that it was only after the publication of the Report of the Indian Industrial Commission of 1916-1918, which went into the question of the relative availability of the different sources of energy in India for economic or industrial use, such as the sea, the wind, sun-light and fuels of various kinds, and their insistence on the well-known economic principles that all economic progress is founded on economy of power and that the industrial future of a country is bound up with its access to cheap energy, that the Government of India itself took up the preliminary question of a survey of the hydro-electric possibilities of the country. Since this was done, the Government of India have published reports embodying these surveys, and it is significant that till now only *three* such reports have been published. I trust I need not labour further the point that Hydro-Electric Schemes are, in fact, comparative novelties in India, and that obviously, when Mr. Bastow wrote on the subject they had not attained *that* degree of popular approval they have since attained, and that would have justified his making more pointed proposals for our State taking *at once* the action that the British Government then contemplated, for the generation of power from the Kallar.

At present, such schemes seem to be the order of the day. Mention has been made of what Mysore has done in this direction. Members probably do not know how much other Native States have done in the same matter. The State of Gwalior, for instance, is apparently very forward already in this. Some months back, when I travelled in North India, I happened to meet an Engineer of the P. W. D. of Gwalior, who had been connected with such work in the State. Other progressive Native States are keenly alive to the need of developing their hydro-power resources, and are going ahead very fast.

Secondly, to turn to another point raised in the discussion. We have been reminded that *ours* is an agricultural country, and one in which every decade the population has been growing by 16 per cent., that already the pressure of population on the means of subsistence is being felt keenly; and that it behoves us, therefore, to do all that may further the growth of our food production. The point of this line of suggestion seems to be that we should reserve the Kallar for irrigation and not for power, directly or indirectly. I concede the assumptions, though not the corollary. Our most recent figure for the growth of our population goes, I believe, even beyond 16 per cent. But should we forget that the economic growth of the State depends on its increased productive capacity, and that such a growth of it as will not, side by side with our great growth in numbers, impair the existing standard of life, is *impossible* in a mere agricultural economy? I submit that we shall not *better* the existing conditions by merely increasing the area under wet cultivation. It is very much better that we should produce more wealth than more paddy, particularly if for the same

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswamy Aiyangar.]

sacrifice we can get so much of the former as to exceed the utmost growing capacity in the latter. This is an elementary conception, and my justification for stressing it now is that it has been overlooked. If, with the same amount of productive energy now required to produce an amount of wealth equal to x in an agricultural economy, you are able to produce mx, or even x^2 by a combined agricultural and industrial economy, it stands to reason that the latter is to be preferred. In *normal* conditions, no country suffers for want of food, which makes this choice, and it is such a choice that is likely to be before us, if an era of cheap industrial power is soon begun in this State.

The alternatives we have to consider to-day are, *first*, the *early* provision of an abundant, continuous, and constant supply of cheap energy in Travancore, such as will give a great fillip to our industrial development, and following it, the complete economic transformation of Travancore, and *second*, as against the former, going on without such advantages, and in our present way.

I take it that on such an economic question the Council, non officials as well as officials, will be agreed. I take it also that the Council, which has just been inaugurated, cannot more strikingly justify the confidence reposed in it by the Sovereign and by the people, and discharge more thoroughly the work it has been entrusted with, than by making a good *beginning* and taking a reasonable attitude towards a question like this, so vital to the further economic development of the State. It is a question of making the State richer, more influential, more prosperous, and of ensuring to its people a higher degree of material comfort and of material prosperity, in the *near* future, as compared with the present. This is a very serious responsibility that this House should be called upon to assume so early in its life, namely, that of deciding a question of such moment. Had I been a non-official and been faced with this responsibility, I should not have shared the gratification that may ensue from the chance to decide this all important matter being shifted from the Government to this assembly. The Government may have taken action themselves, and, I venture to affirm that, in *this* matter, had they done so, they would have been justified by the results. When, many years ago, Sir Seshadri Aiyar, in the face of opposition, and at a time when experts were rare in the country, started his great Cauvery Power Scheme, he was scoffed at. To-day, if a proposal were to be made to erect another statue of this statesman, the people of Mysore would have it of gold. I am confident that the position of our Government is just like Sir Seshadri Aiyar's, but, nevertheless, they have not thought fit to proceed ahead, without first placing the matter before this Council.

This question of a reference to the Council raises a minor issue suggested by the first section of Mr. Krishna Aiyar's amendment that the mover has accepted. I opposed it and would still do so. I would ask: "Is it necessary? In what instances have the Government, in the recent

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

history of Travancore, shown a disposition to move, without such consultation?". We began our existence as a new Council only yesterday. To-day, we display our suspicion of the Government, by attempting to tie their hands in this matter! Is it likely that the clear expression of the opinion of this House on this question will be lost on the Government? If not, why press this amendment?

If, on the other hand, I am asked why, conceding so much, I still demur to the acceptance of the amendment, I shall answer by submitting a small difficulty, namely that the amendment is of the nature of a "tacking" motion. In Logic there is an example of a common poser, "Have you given up beating your wife?"—to which, on account of its tacking together *two* different propositions, it is impossible to say in answer either "yes" or "no." My position as regards the amendment, *when coupled with Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai's proposition*, is very similar. I would, therefore, respectfully suggest to the mover of the amendment that, if his aim is to establish constitutional precedents for the power of this House to deal with such questions as those now under discussion, to establish constitutional safeguards, he might do so in a *direct* manner, and not seek to bring his idea, by a "side-wind", as in this instance.

To turn to the chief question involved in this controversy. I have already explained how the papers now printed could not be placed more expeditiously before the House. Government will regret this delay as much as members on the other side. The Secretariat has done its best to be expeditious. But, as I have already stated, Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai and those who think like him on this question are not those adversely affected by the late presentation. The newspapers have been full on this old question, and particularly against dealing with Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. Special papers have been written on the same side. Only yesterday, I was, on entering this Hall, given a closely printed paper in which much argument was brought to bear on the need to support the Resolution now before the House. In the circumstances, I urge that the other side is not the weaker for any lack of time to stress its arguments on the question. It is the case of the Government which, to some extent, has suffered from the obligation imposed by their position to maintain reticence and an unbiassed mind, and to refrain from needless writing or advocacy. Government have *not*, as I think it was suggested by Mr. K. Paramesvaran Pillai, already decided the question, before coming to this House with it. They have not done any such thing at all, as a reference to the abrupt termination of their Press Communiqué will show. Government have now come forward, confident that they will be assisted by such an expression of views as is possible in this House, and trusting that, after the matter is impartially canvassed, they will receive an almost unanimous support from this Council.

It has been suggested, in the speeches already delivered in support of the motion, that *no* case has been made out to show what the State stands to gain by the proposed scheme. The advantages are stated to be not made out *yet*, and to justify further investigation to discover if there

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

are *any*. I confess to my inability to understand the mover. What does he aim at in his suggestion of further investigation? Read the latter part of his Resolution, which runs as follows:

"such permission, facilities, and concessions as have been prayed for by them to construct and carry out the scheme until Government have had an opportunity of examining the report of any preliminary investigation that the Company may be permitted to undertake in this behalf and of ascertaining in what way and to what extent the State stood to benefit by the said project."

At *this* stage of the question, to come forward and ask what advantages, real or supposed, are derivable from the proposed scheme, is, I venture to say, asking a great deal of us. We all know—on both sides of the House—what these are, cheap power, compensation for our water, opportunity to obtain much-needed fertilisers, a share of the profits, and so forth. But we are asked to wait till a *report* could be obtained from the Company, which has sought the concession. The Company has already done some preliminary work, and found that it has before it a paying proposition. It has also satisfied itself generally in regard to the nature of the work to be done, the certainty of being able to have a continuous supply of a certain quantity of electric power, and it has even found what rates it may *guarantee* to sell the power at. What more can a report now disclose? Is it denied that the estimated power--20,000 H. P.--will not be developed? It is not. That is our first point. Nobody denies that electrical power is the most convenient form of energy, and that the rates quoted therefor by the Company make it also the cheapest for us. Mr. K. Paramesvaran Pillai indeed appeared to suggest that you could have cheaper forms of energy.

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I did not say that we can get cheaper energy than electrical energy.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: I am obliged for the assurance and the correction, and apologise.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: Has the official member's attention been drawn to the opinion of Mr. John Kurien.

PRESIDENT: You are not in order, Mr. Raman Pillai.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: It is unnecessary now for me to deal with this point, as Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai has conceded it.

There is another suggestion underlying the motion for a report and further enquiry, namely, that relating to the possibility of alternative power schemes from other falls in the State. And much has been said about the seeming haste in which the opinion of Mr. Jacob, the late Chief Engineer, was given. Much *undue* stress has been laid upon it for the argument on the other side. May I offer this explanation of what may appear—and has been represented as—inexplicable speed in Mr. Jacob's reply? A Public Works Department which exists for and confines itself to routine, but does not at the same time give its best attention, thought and time to the continuous consideration of possible power and

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

irrigation projects, will not justify its retention, much less acquire the high and deserved reputation which *our* Public Works Department has earned, by its attention to this kind of scientific work. It has been the tradition of this department to encourage in its officers, senior and junior, the tendency to pursue such researches and, when matured, to press them on the Government, both in the interests of the scientific reputation of the authors of the schemes and of the good of the State. As a result of this practice, it is rare to hit upon a scheme or a project for which a considerable amount of valuable data has not been already collected by the Public Works Department. Naturally, when the Chief Engineer is asked for a report on a particular scheme, for which he has the data accessible, he is able to give his reply with a promptness suggestive of the action of an automatic machine. This is what Mr. Jacob did. Instead of a compliment due to him for his quickness and prevision, the reproach that he has been willing to be tutored by the Government has been levelled against him! The printed papers will show that he has investigated as many as eleven Schemes and come to the conclusion that the best of them was the Kallar Scheme.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: The statement is not quite correct. Mr. Jacob says in his report that it is only *one* of the best schemes.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: I stand corrected, but unrepentant. Mr. Jacob's opinion is to be found and inferred not only in his first letter, giving the names of the eleven possible schemes, but in the subsequent correspondence. It is for the members to say, from the perusal of the papers, whether I have no justification for saying that Mr. Jacob would have stultified himself, if, along with his pushing of the Kallar Scheme, he were to be supposed to have had in mind schemes in every way at least as good as, if not better than, the Kallar Scheme. May I say that, in connection with the doubt suggested by the members on the other side—a doubt that might naturally occur to any one—of the possibility of better alternatives having been left unexplored, I took the trouble to consult a gentleman, who knows every inch of the ground concerned, and knows Travancore, very well, and whose professional knowledge and reputation are both high, whether any alternative scheme *can* be suggested? I understand there is just *one* other, and that it will produce less energy and cost more than the one we are considering, and, at the same time, prove more useful to Cochin than to Travancore. My information is definite that there is no scheme, as at present known, that can be classed under the same category as the Kallar Scheme, as regards the good the State will derive therefrom.

If this point is agreed to, the next, namely, what good you hope to derive from it, may be easily met. You get cheap energy and you may get fertilisers almost at your door. The papers will show how the Director of Agriculture pointed out that the power is to be used for manufacturing nitrogenous manure, which now costs a great deal, and without which we cannot undertake the intensive cultivation of our lands, which is so

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. G. Parameswaran Pillai.]

necessary to meet the demand for food from our growing population. There is also one aspect of the question which is more familiar to the economist than to the layman, and to which the Government has already drawn attention, to which I might pointedly refer now. It is that, in such matters, the supply creates the demand, and not the demand the supply. You will observe that the energy you will get will be cheap enough. Thus, if you take the whole load, you can get it at the main switch board at a rate of 4½ pies per T. U. What you are likely to get is 5,000 H. P. of energy, and if you take no more, the cost is to be 6 pies per unit. The correspondence will also show that the great cost of erecting means of transmission need not be yours, as the Company will undertake this too, and deliver at any station too, at proportionally higher rates.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Will the member say where this is referred to?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: It is the last telegram in the correspondence. I would next ask the gentlemen on both sides of the House to peruse the printed papers carefully and see whether it has not been demonstrated there that the scheme is, in every sense, a paying proposition.

I must draw your attention next to one point which has been much discussed in our local press, and by our public. We are asked on all sides: "Why should this Firm be given the work? Can't the Government do it?" The Government have already large commitments, and justly feel that they cannot raise the huge capital necessary to start the scheme. Apart from the unwisdom—generally admitted by economists—of a State embarking on such an undertaking, there is one aspect of the matter which must show that the State cannot take up the work, so long as it can get a private agency to undertake the financing and execution of the scheme. It is this. If Government have the money, such money will be more wisely used in creating or helping to create industries which would use the power produced, than lock it all up in a scheme for generating the power. I submit that it is not a mere question of the competency of Government to conduct a technical investigation. It is, rather, a question of producing a conviction in the minds—not of the members of this Council, nor *of our* public—but of the great financial magnates, who have it in their power to subscribe the capital required for the successful launching of the scheme. Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. apparently have an advantage in this respect that our State has not. Their confidence seems warranted by their position as technical advisers of the Tatas, who are obviously well able to make a wise choice, when they have the whole world to choose from, and of provincial administrations in India.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Does the member know that the Firm are still consulting engineers to the Tatas?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: I am not aware that they have ceased to be so. The official publication in my hand describes them as still Tatas' advisers. In any case, their *retention* of the position is not material to my argument. Their selection is.

We have an offer from a Firm of position, which is prepared to take the full risk in the scheme, which is prepared to undertake the investigation and charge you nothing for it, or but a fraction of the cost as the scheme matures or not. The position of this Firm gives an additional assurance to those who have suggested that the chances of our State obtaining due compensation for the water of the tail race supplied to Madura are meagre. For, even if it were true, which it is not, that the relative position of Travancore and the British Government will ever work against our obtaining a just price for our water, the acceptance of a partnership with the Company for this compensation will give us in discussions with Madras a useful auxiliary in a powerful corporation, with plenty of experience of the matter, and sensitive to its economic interest, as a partner. To conclude, we have so many advantages clearly before us, if we go on with the scheme, and yet, we are asked to *give up* those advantages. For, to tell the Firm to drop this matter now is not merely dropping them, but it is virtually dropping the scheme. What other firms of equal status would hereafter be open to us for such co-operation in pushing on this scheme, if our reputation is affected, as it is sure to be, by giving the go-by to this Firm, after such prolonged negotiation with them? This is a most serious matter, and the House must consider it. Take the scheme, as put before you, or drop it. Don't beat about the bush, and say, you require time, you require further investigation and so forth. If you do not want to proceed with the Scheme, say so clearly. Other Governments may proceed where we are timid or apprehensive. After the prolonged investigations and discussions we have already had, the suggestion of more investigation, and of more consideration by "expert" committees will be construed by people conversant with business, as mere pretexts for abandoning the idea. Let there be no illusion whatever about it. The matter admits of a straight vote, of a simple "yes" or "no". And, with all the earnestness I am capable of, I would beg of you to give your decision clearly and unmistakably on the general issue by *rejecting* the motion of Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI: Sir, it is difficult to analyse all the papers placed before us yesterday and the day before yesterday and to set forth the salient points contained therein. This is a very difficult subject about which there has been a good deal of discussion. The time at the disposal of the members is also very brief. I would, therefore, confine my observations to a few of the most important points raised in the course of the discussion. There has been some talk about experts and their differences of opinion. I think experts will always continue to differ among themselves. In any case we should not allow ourselves to be befogged by an impenetrable cloud of so-called expert opinion. It is always the civilian administrator who has the power and responsibility of saying the last word in all such matters and we have had enough materials in the shape of expert opinion to form a reasonable

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. C. Mammen Mappillai.]

view of the case put before us. I propose to approach the question from the stand-point of a plain man of average common-sense. We should proceed once for all definitely and finally with the instinctive perception, imagination and observation possessed by one as a man in the street and not as an expert.

Now the carrying out of the scheme will be beneficial in two ways. First of all it supplies irrigation water to the Madura District, and there is also the possibility of generating cheap electric power. Now the question is whether we should allow Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. to work the Scheme or whether we should work it ourselves sometime in the future when we shall be in a position to find the necessary funds for doing so. Among the disadvantages which have been put forward in allowing Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. to handle the scheme, it has been said that we are committing an unpardonable crime in allowing valuable natural resources of the country like a portion of the water of the Periyar river to go out of the country and that the volume of water in the Periyar will be diminished to such an extent as would prejudicially affect the interests of the country. As a plain man I am quite unable to see that the diversion of the water of one of the smaller minor tributaries of the Periyar river into which the drainage of about 70 square miles of the catchment area flows will materially affect the volume of water in the Periyar river which draws into itself the drainage water of more than 1,500 square miles. The enormous water that is being poured by the Periyar river into the Arabian Sea we shall not be able to utilise. It is unthinkable that the diversion of an infinitesimally small volume of Periyar water to the Madura District will prejudicially affect the interests of the country. It has been argued that the diversion of this water might prevent the utilisation of land that is waiting to be irrigated in Travancore itself. I have myself travelled up the Periyar to a great extent and I have talked with several persons who know the locality very well like the Alwaye Executive Engineer, the Conservator of Forests and the Director of Agriculture, and also with persons living on either side of the Periyar, and I confidently state that the land on either side of the Periyar is uneven and rocky and quite unsuitable for conversion into cultivable lands by irrigation. You have not got anywhere near the Periyar either in its upper reaches or lower course any considerable extent of flat land which alone is suitable for large schemes of irrigation. Even if there should exist such suitable areas though unknown to me, there would be water enough left in the Periyar for their irrigation. By allowing the Kallar Scheme to proceed, we shall get one of the finest falls in all India from which hydro-electric energy could be generated without any detriment to the interests of this country. Electricity cannot be generated from this fall in such a large measure by allowing the water to remain in Travancore.

Besides obtaining cheap power, we could sell this water at very profitable rates to extensive stretches of thirsty land in the Madura District. The only misgiving that I have felt with regard to the irrigation part of the scheme is about our obtaining the maximum possible

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

benefits out of it. I would, therefore, urge upon Government the desirability of completing the details of the arrangement with the Government of Madras about water rates, expenses and all other possible connected matters before granting the concession to Messrs Alfred Dickinson & Co. If this is not done, we might be deprived of a considerable share of the benefits to which we are entitled. Therefore, I suggest that before our Government should commit themselves with regard to the scheme in any shape or manner, they should satisfy themselves as to the financial benefit that we are likely to derive from the irrigation part of the scheme. If possible, the amount of money compensation that we are to get from the water should be made clear.

I do not believe that the British Government would deliberately try to drive a hard or unfair bargain with us, but it is the duty of our Government to see that our experiences of the Periyar lake are not repeated in this instance. It is now quite clear to us that that arrangement has been very unjust to our country. What is the guarantee that the next generation may not say the same thing about the Kallar arrangement which we are now engaged in making? May I take it that the Government will be able to give us the assurance that we shall get the fullest possible benefit and that there is no possibility of anybody subsequently bargaining us out of the benefits that are justly our due? On such an assurance, I for one would be very glad to support the scheme which has been put forward before the Council.

MR. JOSEPH PANJIKARAN: It is a pity that Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar refused to go into the details of the question before the House. It is more pitiable still that my friend, Mr. Mammen Mappillai, should recommend such a momentous question to the instincts of the man in the street and ask the House to be led by charity to the thirsty lands in Madura. In matters like this, considerations of charity and self-sacrifice should not be allowed to enter. We cannot alienate the valuable resources of our State for charity. Charity begins at home.

The Kallar Hydro-Electric Scheme which is now before the House is one of momentous importance. It involves very large interests. Those who know something of the Periyar project are aware how disadvantageous a concern it has proved to Travancore. An area of about 200 square miles of our soil is practically lost to us, and what we get in return is only about Rs. 40,000 per year.

Now according to the expert opinon of Mr. Bastow, the Kallar project is pregnant with evil results to the real interests of Travancore. The diversion of Kallar water was first proposed by the Madras Government as an irrigation project; and Mr. Bastow, the then Chief Engineer, opposed the project on very many grounds. He said, as seen from the papers, that the flood and the fertilising silt on which our *punja* cultivation depends would be injuriously affected, that in summer navigation would be tampered with, that, owing to diminution in the flow of water, salt water would work up to the higher reaches of the river and would injure paddy cultivation, and so on. At any rate an area of about

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. P. Raman Pillai.]

70 square miles of our valuable land will be ours only in name as in the case of the Periyar Project. The loss in the shape of timber now growing and that will be growing in future will be enormous. As against these real evils, many prospective advantages are held out to the public which are more illusory than real. It is said that this scheme will enable Travancore to purchase electricity, and that it will contribute to our industrial progress. Electricity is certainly powerful, but unless we can get it so cheap as to enable us to replace other means of developing power, electricity is of no use to us. Nothing appears in the communications that have passed between our Government and Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. to explain whether the Company will be able to supply us with electric power at such a cheap rate as to enable us to replace other sources of developing power.

Another advantage held out is that our State will get one-third of the profits after deducting 7 per cent. interest to the debenture holders and 10 per cent. dividend to the share-holders. But will there be any profitsleft after deducting the above interest and dividend? Where is again the guarantee that the working of the scheme will be a success? Then again we are told that this country will get something by way of water-cess from the Madras Government for the tail water. We may get something! But what is that something? On this important aspect of the question the Press Communiqué is silent. Now the Resolution moved by Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai is only one of caution. He does not say to the House that the scheme should not be worked out, but only that the contract with the Company should not be rushed through with electric speed. On a question of such importance a committee of experts to investigate the advantages and disadvantages to our State and the possibilities of our getting the advantages promised to us is highly necessary even in spite of the cost that it may entail. So I am in full concurrence with the Resolution moved by my friend, Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: Sir, the learned member on the Government side has been telling us, is rather accusing us—non-official members—as a body, that we are supporting a blocking motion or delaying motion. I may tell him that this is an uncharitable insinuation. We have come here sacrificing our time and money not to impede or block the work of Government but to help the Government as far as it lies in our power.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: Mr. President, may I rise to a point of personal explanation? By blocking motion, I meant not the blocking of business, but the materialising of the scheme. I did not say that there was any intention on the part of the other side to block the business of the meeting.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: All that I wish to say is that we are as keen in the discharge of our duties as anybody else towards helping Government. The learned official member asked in the course of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

his speech: "Where is the rushing through of the scheme?" I shall answer that point in the course of my speech.

Although my interpellation requesting permission to see all papers connected with the Kallar Scheme has been vetoed by the President, I feel thankful to him for having kindly placed in our hands last evening such of the papers as he deemed 'important', to understand the question.

I have carefully read the papers supplied and anxiously thought over the matter. I have come to the conclusion that the Hydro-Electric or Kallar River Water-Power Scheme put forward by Messrs. Alfred Dickinson Co. in September, 1919, is the same as the Cardamom Hills Project put forward by the Madras Government in March, 1909, with this difference that, while the Madras Government told us at the very start that their object was to divert water sufficient to irrigate not less than 28,000 acres in British India and mentioned five years later, when the Darbar put up a stout resistance to the proposal, that their Scheme combined irrigation with generation of cheap power in South India which would be a source of additional profit to the people of Travancore, the Company placed in the forefront of their scheme the industrial aspect, keeping rigid silence over the question of water and payment for the same, as if they were unconcerned with the waste water, until Mr. John Kurien raised the question pointedly at the conference held on the 12th November, 1921.

The Government Press Communiqué tells us that "the Madras Government dropped the matter" at a stage when the Darbar admitted that their principal argument against accepting the proposal was based on rough estimates and opinions of persons. This was subsequent to March, 1917. Unfortunately, that final letter from the Madras Government dropping the matter is not among the printed papers supplied to the Council. Further, the Press Communiqué simply mentions that Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. are "Consulting Engineers." It does not say to whom. If the Company are consulting engineers to the Madras Government as they are reported to be, the omission in the Communiqué should be considered significant, especially when we remember the fact that the interval between the correspondence of the Madras Government with the Travancore Government varied from 5 years to 5 months. There is every reason, therefore, to believe that the present scheme is a revival of the old one.

In spite of the industrial colouring which the Madras Government gave their project, Mr. Bastow was shrewd enough to see through it and observe: "So I think for the moment we may disregard the circumstance that there is a Power Scheme on the boards at all.....What is its value and what do they offer for it?" On the contrary, alt ough the Company put forward the scheme entirely as an industrial scheme, Mr. John Kurien saw through it and said that he was not very sanginue about the success of the electrical portion of the scheme, but that the irrigation side of it was very rosy, and that if the Madras Government would accept the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. P. Raman Pillai.]

principle of payment suggested by the Board we would get an annual revenue of 4 to 5 lakhs of rupees.

The attitude of the Company throughout the whole transaction has also to be borne in mind in deciding the question of their real object. The first application made in their behalf by their solicitors appears to have been sent on the 21st June, 1919, or still earlier. But, unfortunately, a copy of the first application is not among the printed papers. However, from their first application down to the time of the conference in November, 1921, every letter of the Company was written with the object of getting an "*assurance*" or a "*concession*", the two terms being used, I believe, synonymously by them. It is noteworthy that every reply sent by the Darbar contained the expression "no assurance," or "no concession." My impression, on reading the papers, is that the Company reckoned without their host. The Dewan repeatedly refused to grant any concession or assurance to the Company, until he knew exactly what they were about and how the State stood to gain or lose by it. That the Dewan maintained an unbiassed attitude throughout is also seen from what he told Mr. K. Parameswaran Pillai at the conference. I hope he will maintain the same attitude even at the time the official members are called upon to vote. The real question at issue was made manifest only at the conference. If he had not at heart the welfare and prosperity of His Highness' subjects, the concession would have been granted and no conference held. Besides, the repeated insistence of the Company on making the grant of the concession a condition precedent to their investigation, the inability or unpreparedness of their agent, Mr. Richards, to speak about the question of cost of the project when called upon by the Dewan to speak at the November conference (held 1½ years after the Company's application), their studied silence *re* the place where the power-house is to be located, their previous *negotiation* with the Madras Government, their assumed indifference *re* the eventual disposal of the waste water, so much so that the Chief Engineer, in his letter of 1st June, 1920, stated that "the future development of irrigation in North Travancore might be protected by the introduction of sluices in the proposed dam, which would permit of the discharge of a proportion of the water into the existing channel below the dam when not being utilised for hydro-electric purposes", the inattention Mr. Richards paid to Mr. John Kurien's enquiry *re* the Karimbankuthu falls and the way in which he brushed aside the matter when the Dewan pointedly drew his attention to it, the suggestion of the Company that "it would be sufficient if their (the Government of Madras) reply deals with the general principle, that is, their willingness to make payment for the water, leaving the question of the amount for detailed consideration later", the Resident's laconic telegram accepting the principle of payment in accordance with the above suggestion and not in answer to the Government's letter, sent 3 months and 29 days after receiving the letter of the Travancore Government dated the 19th December, 1921, and his failure to inform the Travancore Government the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

rate as requested for by them, lead to the only conclusion that the primary object of the Company is diversion of the Kallar water at a rate in the fixing of which, when once the concession is granted, the Travancore Darbar will be at the mercy of the Madras Government. The only reason why, of late, an amount of hurry is seen in the disposal of the matter, appears to me to be the possibility of Travancore passing out of the control of the Madras Government in the near future. The Company thought they had manipulated the scheme so dexterously that the attention of the Darbar was focussed solely on a consideration of the details of the industrial aspect of it. To their credit it must be said that they had succeeded wonderfully well. The Chief Engineer thought that the irrigational needs of North Travancore could be met by providing sluices to the proposed dam. The Conservator thought that the introduction of cheap electric tramways and the demand for paper and paper-pulp industry would compensate the loss to his department, while the Director of Agriculture simply jumped at the proposal, seeing the prospect it held out for the supply of chemical manures at a cheap rate. Municipal Presidents thought that the day was near when no more complaints would be heard about the lighting of streets. Seeing all these people happy, Government also heaved a sigh of relief. It was then that the question of payment of water rose up and exposed the hollowness of the whole dream.

The crux of the situation lies in the question which Mr. Bastow raised on the 5th August, 1916, and about which the Government requested the British Resident for an answer in their letter dated the 19th December, 1921. That question still remains unanswered. *Re* the objections which Mr. Bastow raised, I am inclined to think that they would not have been raised at all, but for the very unfavourable terms which the Madras Government made us accept in parting with the Periyar water. The Cardamom Hills Project was opened at a time when that sore was very fresh. They were like the burnt child that dreads the fire. The Darbar, therefore, made mountains of their mole-hills. Had they known the real object of this Company at the inception, I do not know if Mr. Bastow's objections would not have been repeated. As it is, Mr. Jacob has withdrawn them. But to ask us to agree to the granting of the concession before knowing exactly what we are going to get for the water is to ask us to take a leap in the dark. It is, at any rate, not doing business with a Firm which has come to do business with us. It is tantamount to asking us to drive on with the cart before the horse. I, therefore, find myself unable to oppose the Resolution. But I should like to amend it as follows:

"*Clause* (*a*) *of the Resolution.*—*Delete* the words "examining the report of any preliminary investigation that the Company may be permitted to undertake in this behalf and of ascertaining in what way and to what extent the State stood to benefit by the said project", and *insert* instead "considering the rate which the Madras Government may be prepared to offer for the water which will flow into the British territory".

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: May I ask that clauses (*b*) and (*c*) be dropped?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. T. K. Velu Pillai.]

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: I have got a scheme for that also. I would propose the appointment of a committee consisting of the Director of Agriculture and a few officers, such as the Director of Industries, and two non-official gentlemen, *i. e.*, Messrs G. Paramesvaran Pillai and A. Govinda Menon, to investigate and let us know how the proposed diversion of the Kallar water will affect the interests of Travancore. But I stand on very delicate ground, because of want of notice under Standing Order No. 49.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: I object to it because there is no notice.

The amendment fell through for want of notice.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: Sir, I am really encouraged by the circumstance that the Government is not particular about this scheme. I am also very glad to have known the views of the members on the other side of the House some of whom are expert officers, but it is unfortunate that more of them are not coming forward with their opinions in this important matter. I wish that experienced and learned people like the present Chief Secretary and Mr. Anatanarayana Aiyar would benefit us with their views.

PRESIDENT: They might speak. The discussion is not yet over.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: I am glad that you have been pleased to allow us an opportunity so early in the history of this Council to consider a question of such a momentous nature as the one under discussion. It is not my business to analyse the subject in its detail. To a layman, and I must certainly admit that I am a layman, so far as this matter is concerned, it would not be possible to do so. There are certain outstanding features which I think would appeal to anyone. The first argument on the non-official side is that the scheme involves the giving away of the natural resources of the country. The necessity for the development of Travancore territories for the benefit of the population of the country has to be emphasised in this connection. Two successive Dewans, one of whom subsequently rose to a place in the Governor's Executive Council in Madras, and the other a reputed lawyer and public man who was presiding over the highest tribunal in this country for several years, have disapproved of the proposed scheme. There is a strong feeling in the country against the exploitation of the resources of the country by foreigners. There have been several companies to whom the rights of the people have been bartered away. There have been monazite companies and several other companies by encouraging which the valuable rights and privileges of the people have been lost. So far as the decisions in the previous agreements with these companies are concerned, they have not been very much to the advantage of the State. We know the history of the Periyar Project. There is the fact that the present Dewan took up this question very soon after

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

he took charge of the administration. The present Chief Engineer has made his recommendation in great haste. The data on which the Government have based their conclusions are not forthcoming. There is the impression that the Madras Government is desirous of securing water for irrigation purposes in the Madura District and there is the fact that the Company have approached this Government with their plans soon after the proposal of the Madras Government proved ineffective. Whatever may be the merits of their opinions, the fact remains that the public look upon this matter with increasing anxiety. This Council cannot question the *bona fides* of the representatives of the people, nor can we question the good faith of the officers of the Government. Along with this we have to consider the arguments on the other side. As has been pointed out by Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar, for whom I have very great respect, the most important argument on the side of Government seems to be that the present Chief Engineer has recommended the scheme. The Director of Agriculture and the Conservator of Forests, both of whom are Travancoreans, have also agreed that the scheme should be worked by the Company.

The gentlemen on this side of the House are as anxious as, if not more than, the members on the other side about the welfare of the country. We do not join issue on that point. To my mind, it appears that, although it was a large issue at the beginning, it has now reduced itself into a small one. We are frittering away our time in discussing minor matters. I find some gentlemen attaching very much importance to the rate of cess for the amount of water diverted into the British territory. To my mind, this is a very unimportant question. If 28,000 acres are to be brought under cultivation, it will not give anything more than Rs. 28,000, or if the rate is Rs. 2 per acre, the figure may rise to Rs. 56,000. Let us for argument's sake take it that the sum will amount to a lakh of rupees. What is it as compared to the natural resources of the country? That was the point about which the difference of opinion arose. That question is now being narrowed down to some insignificant considerations. Sir, the real question is whether it is to our advantage to give the Company the concession asked for,—whether it is to our advantage to allow water to be taken to the Madura District. I agree with Mr. Raman Pillai in letting water to that district, if there be difficulty for water there. If we can oblige them we may do so. But let us not oblige them to our detriment. Let us not attempt to give food to them before we find out our real position and assure ourselves that the diversion of water will not prejudicially affect the agricultural classes in this State and prejudice the prospects of future industries.

On this graver question, my friends on the other side who are experts give conflicting opinions. Under these circumstances, the ordinary layman finds it difficult to decide the case. But there are certain factors. If the question is merely one of water for irrigation, I think the Madras Government can come forward and take advantage of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. J. John Nidiry.]

its position. At page 45 of the printed papers they say that the objections raised by the Darbar do not hold good, so that, if the Madras Government cares, it can take advantage of the admission made by the Travancore Government. Sir, this water part of the question is an unimportant one,—whether we are prepared to give the water or not. Please excuse me for repeating it once again. I have also consulted experts. Yesterday I had the opportunity of talking to a friend of mine of 30 years' acquaintance. I shall call him an intimate friend. We have been friends for a very long time. I asked him if, apart from his official position and in the confidence of personal friendship, he could tell me that he could recommend the concession to be granted to the Company. He said he could recommend it. This morning I asked the head of another development department. He was also of the same opinion. There is also one important aspect on which we should bestow a great deal of reflection. If Travancore has become so bad that people who have been trained as experts at the cost of our Government, people who are natives of Travancore, who are to live here after retirement and whose children are to live here as well, are to be won over by anybody, whether it be by the Company or by anybody else, I stoutly maintain that there is no use of talking of natural resources and national advancement. This is not a question of views, but a question of facts and figures. There is no estrangement among the people. There is no standpoint of Government apart from that of the people. There ought not to be and there is no difference between the two. The Resolution now before the House is an innocuous one. The mover only asks for a little more care and a little more prudence. He does not want the scheme to be given up. The scheme need not be now considered on its merits. That has to be reserved for a future occasion. In the meantime, let us have the proposal carefully examined and the scheme thoroughly investigated. I trust that Government will give us the opportunity. When we have the data, we shall be able to understand the matter more clearly. The interest of the country demands the adoption of this patriotic Resolution and I am very glad to support it.

MR. J. JOHN NIDIRY: Sir, the scheme under discussion is named the Kallar Hydro-Electric Scheme. I think the name given to the scheme is misleading. I would call it the Kallar Hydro-Electric and Irrigation Scheme, because two important schemes, *viz.*, an electric scheme and an irrigation scheme are involved in it. The two parts of the scheme should, therefore, be dealt with separately.

As regards the electrical side of the scheme, I am of opinion that the terms offered by the Firm, Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co., are attractive enough from a business point of view. The Company is prepared to give us a one-third share of the electrical output at a very cheap rate and also a fair share of the profits, after payment to the share-holders of the Company of a dividend of 10 per cent. But I am not very hopeful that we may get any share of the profits after paying such a dividend from a

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

company run by Europeans on the usual lavish scale. But there is the advantage that we need not contribute a single pie towards the working of such an expensive scheme.

The next question is whether we should wait for further investigations. Of course, there is a difference of opinion between two of our Chief Engineers. Some of the members think that we have not got definite data to begin with. I think otherwise. A responsible body like the Development Board which consists of able officers who have had electrical experience both in England and in India have come to the unanimous conclusion that the scheme is advantageous to the country. That being the case, I should think that the opinion of those officers should be accepted and acted upon instead of inviting the opinion of Sir Visvesvaraya and other experts. Under the circumstances, any further delay and waste of money on the investigation is uncalled for and inexpedient.

In my opinion, the irrigation side of the scheme is more important, because we are sure to get a good compensation for the diversion of the Kallar water to the neighbouring British territory. As pointed out by my friend, Mr. Mammen Mappillai, it is advisable that we should get definite data as to the water-cess which the British Government may be able to give us. They simply say that they will give us some cess. What is the datum or the basic principle of the rate of the cess to be fixed? Is it to be based on the amount of water that is diverted or is it according to the acreage of land brought under cultivation? Before ascertaining all these details, my submission is that our Government should not commit themselves to any definite agreement with the Firm. I suppose that, for ascertaining these facts, the appointment of a Committee of investigation is not necessary, as they may be ascertained by Correspondence with the Madras Government. I understand from the papers that the Madras Government have already made certain investigations in regard to the area that may be brought under cultivation. They might have got the necessary statistics already. It is, therefore, desirable that Government should see that a reasonable rate on some basic principle is laid down before any agreement with the Madras Government is finally settled.

With these observations I have to bring to the President's kind attention the provisions of Standing Order No. 52, under which any Resolution involving several points may be divided before the Resolution is put to the vote. As the proposition contained in the Resolution of Mr. G. Parameswaran Pillai involves, in my opinion, several points, I would request the President to be good enough to make use of the provisions contained in Standing Order No. 52. From what I was able to gather from the speeches of the members on this side of the House, I find that there are some who think that an investigation is necessary and others who think that such an investigation is not necessary. Then again as regards the question of water cess and other points, there are divergent views. The Resolution is thus capable of division as it has been discussed under several view-points.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai.]

Dr. N. KUNJAN PILLAI: Sir, the Resolution proposed by Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai consists of two parts, *viz.*, (1) that no assurance should be given to Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. that they will be granted permission, facilities and concessions to construct and carry out the Kallar Hydro-Electric Scheme until Government have had an opportunity of examining the report of any preliminary investigation that they may be allowed to undertake, and (2) that a Committee of experts be appointed to investigate the possibility of the Kallar water being made use of for irrigational and other purposes in Travancore and examine how the proposed diversion of the Kallar water will affect the interests of the country and also to recommend the terms and conditions under which the investigation of the scheme should, if at all, be entrusted to the above-said Company. I shall deal with these two parts of the Resolution separately and try to convince the House, if the time at my disposal permits, of the necessity of voting against both parts of the Resolution. In dealing with the first part, I shall first speak about the disadvantages to the State by accepting the offer of Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co., and then about the advantages that the State stands to gain.

As regards the disadvantages, I must point out that my friends on the other side of the House take their stand almost entirely on the objections raised by Mr. Bastow, one of our former Chief Engineers, against the Cardamom Hills Project. I shall consider and dispose of these objections one by one. At the very outset, I must say that I read Mr. Bastow's letter over and over again with a view to find out whether he had any facts and figures to support his contentions and that in this respect I was completely disappointed. As Mr. Bastow did not adduce any data in defence of the position that he took up, it could not but be concluded that his statements were based on mere assumptions and not on actual facts and figures. Mr. Jacob's reply in meeting the arguments of Mr. Bastow was, on the other hand, based on data which were collected by actual investigation. Most of the speakers on the other side of the House laid much emphasis on the point that Mr. Jacob, who sent his reply to the reference made to him by Government on the subject in four days, could not possibly have made any investigation into the matter, and that he simply acted in accordance with the wishes of the Government. In regard to this point, I wish to invite the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Jacob has stated in his letter to Government, dated the 5th December, 1921, that the figures given therein have been *ascertained* to be such and such. Mark the word, 'ascertained', which means that the necessary investigations must have been made previously and data collected. It is only reasonable to suppose that the Public Works Department must have been engaged in making the investigations long before the receipt of the Government's letter on the subject by Mr. Jacob and that the data collected must have been available to him when he wrote his reply to Government. As against the definite data

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

contained in Mr. Jacob's reply, one looks in vain for any such data in Mr. Bastow's letter, a document which the non-official members seem to make much of. Mr. Bastow is, no doubt, an engineer of great ability, one who served this country for a considerable length of time and who was quite conversant with local conditions. I have great respect for him; but with due deference to his professional knowledge and his innate love for this country, I cannot help saying that his objections to the Cardamom Hills Project were based more on assumptions than on actual facts and that the attitude which he took in regard to this project was not altogether justifiable. Let us examine his objections and see how far they would stand a close scrutiny. His first objection was that the diversion of the Kallar water into the British territory would bring about a diminution in the volume and height of floods in the Periyar and that there would consequently be a diminution of the fertilising silt that would be deposited on the lands inundated by these floods. I tried to find out the area of wet lands that would thus be affected and from a very rough calculation which I made by reference to the Government of India Survey maps I found that the area of wet lands from Alwaye downwards which are being inundated by the floods in the Periyar would only be about 5,000 acres. I left the garden lands out of this calculation, because a slight increase or decrease in their fertility on account of the increase or decrease in the silt deposited would not be of any material consequence. In the case of wet lands, however, this is a factor to be reckoned with in determining their productive capacity. Out of nearly 5,000 acres of wet lands in the Alangad and Parur taluks which are inundated by the floods in the Periyar, excepting about 500 acres of *punja* lands, the rest is all practically double crop lands which are cultivated twice a year, *viz.*, from Medam to Chingam and from Kanni to Makaram.

Mr. T. K. VELU PILLAI: Sir, it will be interesting to know if the speaker has seen the fields himself.

Dr. N. KUNJAN PILLAI: Yes, I have seen the fields. It is a fact known to all who are acquainted with the conditions prevailing in the Alangad and Parur taluks that, in the case of these double crop lands, floods do more harm than good, particularly to the crop which is cultivated from Medam to Chingam. There is hardly a year in which one does not hear of the Kanni crop on these lands being damaged by floods. Only about three days ago, I received a report from my Inspector at Alwaye that the lands round about that place were submerged for nearly five days and that the crops of paddy, sugarcane and plantain were considerably damaged by the flood. This is practically a common occurrence in almost every year, and the House will, I hope, believe me when I say that during the wet weather, *viz.*, from June to September, the floods in the Periyar are more a curse than a blessing to the cultivators of wet lands on both sides of the river in the Alangad and Parur taluks and that they will only be too grateful if by any means the volume of the floods can be diminished. When inundation is generally found to be more harmful than beneficial to wet cultivation, the question whether

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai.]

the flood is higher or lower by a few inches or even feet, on which Mr. Bastow has laid special emphasis, is not of much importance. Rather than that, it is the duration of the flood that counts. The longer the duration of the flood, the greater will be the harm it does to cultivation, and the duration of the flood depends almost entirely upon the rainfall. It is evident from what has been stated that any diminution in the volume of water which flows through the Periyar during the wet weather will, if at all, be only beneficial to cultivation. But the same cannot be said of the diminution that may take place in the flow of water during the dry weather. For, during the dry weather, the *punja* lands, of which there are about 500 acres, and the Makaram crop on the double crop lands are being irrigated to some extent with the water in the Periyar. If, then, by the diminution in the dry weather discharge, there is the possibility of the brackish water going up the river, irrigation will become impracticable. But from the data furnished by Mr. Jacob—the present Chief Engineer who is a member of this Council will be able to tell us how these data have been obtained—it is seen that the dry weather discharge of the Kallar is only 10 *cusecs* as compared to a total flow of about 170 *cusecs* in the Periyar. An engineer friend of mine told me that a diminution of 10 *cusecs* in the flow of water would only mean the lowering of the depth of water in the river by less than half an inch and that this small diminution in the volume of water would not materially reduce the velocity of the flow which alone would cause the penetration of saline water higher up the river. I know that some members on the other side of the House have lost all faith in experts, because some of them happened to differ in their views about a particular question. Experts like doctors may differ, but, if because of their difference of opinion none of them is to be trusted, I fail to see how a layman could come to a definite conclusion on a highly technical matter. In regard to this particular question that we are now considering, *viz.*, how the diversion of the Kallar water would affect the freshness of water in the Periyar, all the experts, excepting, of course, Mr. Bastow, say that by actual investigation it has been found out that the diversion of the Kallar water would only take away from the Periyar about 10 *cusecs* of water during the dry weather and that the diversion of so much fresh water would not bring more saline water into the river than at present. Mr. Bastow who thought otherwise did not unfortunately collect data as to the volume of water that would cease flowing into the Periyar by damming the Kallar. If he had actually collected the data, he could not have possibly got figures widely differing from those furnished by Mr. Jacob.

Another objection raised by Mr. Bastow is about the possibility of developing irrigation schemes in the Periyar basin. Here again all the officers who have seen that part of the country, except Mr. Bastow, are of opinion that for a distance of about 30 miles from the Kallar the nature of the country is such that no extensive irrigation scheme is practicable and that, if irrigation is possible in the lower reaches of the river, there would be ample water even after the diversion of the Kallar water.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: I wish to know whether the speaker has seen the place himself.

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI: I have seen it once, but not with this object in view.

The quantity of water that flows into a river is proportional to the catchment area. The total catchment area of the Periyar, deducting that of the Periyar Lake, is more than 1,200 square miles and the catchment area of the Kallar is only 73 square miles which is about 6 per cent. of the total. The water that flows into the river from a catchment area of 1,200 square miles will more than suffice for any possible irrigation scheme which may be developed in the lower reaches of the river in the future. This is the opinion of experienced engineers, some of whom are sons of the soil having extensive stakes in the country.

In regard to the loss of land about which Mr. Bastow has written very vehemently, my friend, the Conservator of Forests, will speak at length. It is true that about five square miles of land will be submerged by damming the Kallar river. The area after all is not much. It is only a little over 3,000 acres and the Company has agreed to pay to Government the usual taxes and assessments that are levied on such lands. The Company, no doubt, wants the catchment area of 73 square miles which is now reserved forest to be maintained as such. There is no objection to the exploitation of timber from this area, but no cultivation should be allowed. If cultivation is allowed, the reservoir will silt up, its capacity will diminish, and, to that extent, the volume of water available for the generation of electrical energy and for irrigation purposes will become less. If the scheme is to be worked out, it is as much to the interests of the State as it is to the interests of the Company to prevent the silting of the reservoir. Moreover, it has been stated in one of the letters of this Government to the British Resident that there is very little of forests in the High Range Division and that it is necessary to conserve as much forest as possible there. This point was urged as an argument against giving over the catchment area of the Kallar to the Madras Government in connection with the Cardamom Hills Project.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: Sir, I wish to know whether the reserved forest can be exploited.

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI: This indeed is a very good reason for maintaining the catchment area as reserved forest as required by the Company; and we do not lose our revenue from the forest, because the Company does not object to the exploitation of timber from this area.

MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR: If the timber is exploited, will it affect the supply of water?

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI: It may or it may not. The influence of vegetation on rainfall is a matter on which experts differ.

If this area is disafforested and thrown open for cultivation, Government may get a revenue of about one rupee per acre in the way of assessment. The land is not, however, of such magnificent fertility as is imagined by Mr. Bastow. There may be some good

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai.]

portions here and there; but, generally speaking, it is a kind of inferior grassy land hardly fit for the cultivation of such remunerative crops as tea and cardamom.

So far then as to the chief objections raised by Mr. Bastow. One who reads Mr. Bastow's letter carefully can find out that his real intention in advancing his arguments against the Cardamom Hills Project was not so much to knock the project on the head as to bring home to our Government the necessity of obtaining sufficient compensation for giving away the water which belongs to us and, with a view to emphasise this aspect of the question, he drew a very gloomy and highly exaggerated picture of the possible disadvantages that this country might suffer. It is worthy of note that Mr. Bastow makes a definite statement in his letter that, if in the interests of India we are called upon to make some sacrifices, we should do so, provided that we are given sufficient compensation in return.

Now, Sir, what is the compensation that we can expect to get in the case of the Kallar Hydro-Electric Scheme? In the first place, we are assured of some substantial revenue by the Madras Government for the water which they get for irrigation. It is true that they have not given us an idea of the amount that we can hope to get; but there is the assurance, I am told, that we will get all the water-cess which the Madras Government collect *minus* their working expenses and the interest on the capital which they will have to invest in constructing channels and in executing other necessary works. The latest Press Communiquè of our Government tells us that they will negotiate with the Madras Government and get as favourable terms as possible in the matter of payment for water.

Secondly, we are going to get a share of the profits of the Company. The terms of the Company in regard to this matter have been published in the Press Communiquè and it is not necessary for me to dilate on them. It is believed in some quarters that the Company is not likely to earn any profit over and above 10 per cent. to be paid to shareholders and that the prospect of our Government getting a share of the profits is illusory. The profits of an electric company depend upon the use to which the power is put. If it is used in industrial concerns, the Company will be able to earn a profit of 20 per cent. and more. The object of Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. is to use the power for such purposes and the prospect of our getting a share of the profits under the terms proposed by the Company is not so gloomy as has been pictured by the gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Sir, I am sorry that the time at my disposal will not allow me to discuss various other matters connected with this question, and I shall, therefore, sum up. The Council has had an opportunity of hearing both sides of the question. The possible disadvantages and the probable advantages to the State have been fully described. Some gentlemen still seem to think that the advantages are all imaginary

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

and the disadvantages real. This, I must submit, Sir, is not a fact. The State will certainly gain some material advantages, for example, a substantial and steadily increasing revenue both from the water rate and from a share in the profits of the Company. The State will also get cheap electrical power, if required, for industrial development and for other purposes. As against these advantages, the chief disadvantage is the loss of the Kallar water. It has been shown on the authority of expert opinion that the loss of this water will not materially affect the interests of Travancore. Even if it does to some extent, the small sacrifice that we make on this behalf will be more than compensated by the advantages we stand to gain. The contention that water power resources are national assets and that they should not be given away to a foreign company but should be developed *by* the State and *for* the State, is, no doubt, good in principle and, as a son of the soil, I can certainly appreciate the sentiments underlying this argument. But, is it possible for the State to undertake such a big concern, involving considerable risk and the investment of a capital of not less than a crore of rupees? I say 'no'. There may be people who say that it is possible. But they do not tell us how the State is to finance the business and whether it is desirable on the part of the State to face the risk involved in it. It must also be remembered that the State will not be able to manage an undertaking of such magnitude as cheaply as a private company will do. There is no company in Travancore that will undertake the business, nor is it likely that such a company will come into existence in the near future. We have, therefore, to look to foreign companies and foreign capitalists for the development of this national asset; and there is nothing wrong and, on the other hand, it is certainly to our advantage to seek the aid of foreign capital for this purpose. Remember, Sir, that we are not selling away our rights and the rights of our posterity for all time to come. We can at the end of 40 years buy up the whole concern, if we become rich enough by that time, at a price fixed by independent experts. We are only leasing our rights for a period and we hope to get sufficient compensation in return.

In conclusion, I would appeal to my friends on the other side of the House to take a dispassionate view of the question, and decide on the strength of the facts and figures placed before them whether it is not advantageous to the State to accept the offer of Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: Sir, under Standing Order No. 26, I move that this business be now adjourned.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: I have to speak a few words on the subject.

PRESIDENT: There is a motion before the House and we shall have to see what becomes of it.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I beg to second the motion.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[The President.]

PRESIDENT: Under Standing Order No. 26, a motion may be made that the business be adjourned. I should like to know what the effect will be if such a motion gets passed.

MR. S. PARAMESVARA AIYAR: If this motion be carried, the effect will be that we shall not be able to discuss the subject during this session. Thus the motion will practically fall through automatically and we shall not be arriving at any decision in regard to it.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: It need not be so.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: In view of the importance of the subject and also in view of the time being practically up to-day, if it is possible to postpone the discussion to a subsequent day, that may be done.

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: It appears from the Standing Order that, if there is a motion that the Council pass to the business next in order, and if that motion is carried, the effect will be that the business under discussion shall be considered to be disposed of. But that is not the motion now made.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: It appears to me that there are two motions contemplated by the Standing Order; *first*, that the meeting or business be adjourned, and *second*, that the Council pass to the next subject in order in the agenda. If it is a motion for adjournment, the matter will stand adjourned to a date to be fixed for the purpose. If it is a motion—

PRESIDENT: I must call you to order, Mr. Raman Pillai. Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai has not finished his speech.

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: If it is a motion for adjournment or postponement of the debate, and if the motion is carried, the effect will be that the business will be postponed. It appears to me, that it is only in respect of a motion that the Council pass to the next business that the Standing Order contemplates that the question shall be considered to be disposed of.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: I have made a motion and it is *my* business to explain it. I do not want either the Secretary or Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai to explain it for me. I would only explain to the Council that, according to the Standing Order, there is a motion for adjournment of the business and there is also a motion for an adjournment to pass on to the next business. My motion is a motion for adjournment of the business and it is not for passing on to the next business. If I make the latter motion and if it is carried, the business under discussion shall be considered to be disposed of.

PRESIDENT: I fear that the effect in both cases will be practically the same, and that, in the result, we shall not be able to dispose of this business during the current session.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: May I withdraw the motion?

PRESIDENT: Yes.

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON: Sir, in giving my hearty support to the Resolution now before the House, I beg to state that this is the first time that an opportunity has been given by the Government to a representative of the ryot population immediately affected by the proposed Hydro-Electric Scheme, to have his say on the scheme. It is regrettable that, in neither of the two conferences held under the auspices of the Economic Development Board, was a single individual from either Kunnatnad, Alangad or Parur, where the cultivation depends more or less on a plentiful supply of the Periyar water, asked to be present; and it is still more regrettable that the question of the possible injury that a further reduction of the Periyar water supply may cause to the agricultural population of those taluks received little consideration at the hands either of the Government or of the Board. The Periyar Project has already materially affected the cultivation, especially of the Alangad and Parur taluks, and the facilities of river communication (the only available one practically) between Malayattur and Cochin as regards the transport of agricultural produce.

The material diminution of the volume of water consequent on the Periyar Project has resulted in the inrush of salt water up the river to places where the river water was previously fresh and this state of things has been greatly prejudicial to the cultivation in the Parur and Alangad taluks. A perusal of the correspondence kindly supplied to us by the Government yesterday reveals the fact that the two cardinal points urged against the proposal of the Madras Government to a scheme similar in effect to the one now before this House, were the possible injury that the carrying out of their proposal would bring on the cultivation of the three taluks above mentioned and the necessity of conserving the scanty natural resources of this Government in the High Range Division, and that Government in their present negotiations have paid little attention to these points. The arguments brought forward against the Madras Government's proposal are brushed aside for no explicable reason in the consideration of a similar proposal by a private Firm; and the opinions of two successive Heads of the Administration, and of a Chief Engineer of undoubted merits possessing long experience of the country, besides those of some other prominent officials whose correspondence does not find a place in the publication given to us yesterday, have been given scant attention in the consideration of the present scheme. As a ryot of Kunnatnad and as the representative of the ryots of the Alangad and Parur taluks, I earnestly entreat this House not to be a party to any proposal involving any further diversion of the Periyar water, unless and until a full and detailed investigation is made by a competent authority as regards (1) the injurious effect such diversion may possibly produce on the agricultural prosperity of the people of the taluks above mentioned and also on their health; (2) the possibility of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. R. Dhanukoti Pillai.]

utilising the river water for irrigating the lands on either side of the Periyar; and (3) lastly, the possibility of utilising the water-power of the Periyar at any place *within* the State and *by* the State.

MR. N. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Sir, I wish to have some more information on one or two points connected with the matter under discussion. Some parts of the Periyar run through the Cochin State. Under the Law of Easements, that State is entitled to a regular and uninterrupted flow of water through these parts. It is conceded by this Government that the Kallar Scheme would bring about some reduction in the flow of water in the Periyar. Supposing that reduction to be appreciable, will it not give a right of action to the Cochin State against this State?

Another point on which I wish to be enlightened is this. It is claimed for this Kallar Scheme that it would supply us with cheap power and thus help the development of our industries. That is all right in principle. But what is it going to be in practice? No doubt, under the agreement with the Company, this State is to get a definite quantity of power at a certain price. What is there to prevent this Company from disposing of the balance at a cheaper rate and that to some big foreign Firms? The scheme is to be controlled by this foreign Company for at least 40 years and we are now having some experience with foreign bankers. It has to be noted that electricty generated at this power station cannot profitably be transmitted to distant cities like Madras and Bombay and as such the same has to be utilised for purposes somewhere about the neighbouring places themselves. I can see the possibility of one of the Lancashire or Manchester Mills appearing in some part of the cotton-producing District of Tinnevelly in a near future, and, if so, the Kallar Company can naturally be expected to favour that good customer in all possible ways. That, rather than helping the development of industries in this State, would, to my mind, kill by unequal competition our weaving and other industries which are still in their infant state. I wish to know how the Travancore Government is going to control the Company to avoid such a situation.

MR. R. DHANUKOTI PILLAI: Sir, I have only to explain two points. More than two members have been referring to the valuable forests inside the catchment area. I had been in charge of the High Range Division for nearly 3½ years and I am yet to know where these valuable forests are. The forest included in the catchment area consists of grassy lands. My presumption is that, at the time when the report was made to Government by the Forest Department, evidently they referred to Aiyyappencoil and Perinjankutti and other forests wherefrom we had been extracting teak and other timber. The catchment area consists mostly of undulating grassy land where there is absolutely no growth of timber except on a small fringe on the frontier side. Very probably, the report of the Forest Department was

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

submitted at a time when they did not exactly know where the site for the dam was to be. This site was finally decided only recently after an investigation was made.

Then with regard to the fertility of the soil for tea and paddy cultivation, I have to say that, on representations made by one of the Assembly Members, I think, Mr. Dominic of Kanjirapalli, about 800 acres of forest land were disafforested and thrown open for registry. My information is that, so far, no one has gone in for this land. The fact is that there is great scarcity of labour in the locality and there is also depredation from elephant and bison. Further, at Kumili and other places there are extensive areas fit for paddy cultivation which have been lying fallow for the last 30 years and more. This would come to about 5,000 acres and more. There is no possibility, therefore, of the land within the catchment area being taken up for cultivation. Then with regard to the prospect of tea cultivation, there was an idea of using this land for tea. An attempt was made by one or two people to grow tea and see how far it would be successful. I remember at least two people who made an attempt, but they found out after some time that the growth was so slow that it was not profitable. So, this land, so far as we are concerned, is absolutely useless. From a forest point of view it consists of stunted undulating forest hills. Our revenue is made up not by timber but by the grazing of foreign cattle. For 73 square miles we get about Rs. 1,000 by way of revenue from grazing. There is a little bit of forest on the frontier side from which the extraction of timber will not be interfered with by this scheme. The timber from this forest can be taken only to the British side. At present we are not able to do this for want of road facilities.

When this Kallar Scheme becomes an accomplished fact, it will be quite possible to extract timber from this area which will only be within half a mile or so from the reservoir.

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI: I beg to be permitted to speak in Malayalam.

PRESIDENT: The rule, I believe, is that a member may speak in Tamil or Malayalam, only when he cannot speak in English. I presume you prefer to speak in Malayalam as you can express yourself better in that language. I have no objection.

MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI: Sir, കല്ലാർസ്കീമിനെപ്പറ്റിയുള്ള മിസ്റ്റർ പരമേശ്വരൻപിള്ളയുടെ പ്രമേയത്തെ ഞാൻ ഹാർദ്ദമായി പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നു. ഈ വിഷയത്തെപ്പറ്റി ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട അനുദ്യോഗസ്ഥസാമാജികന്മാർ പലരും വേണ്ടപോലെ പ്രതിപാദിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതുകൊണ്ട് അവയെ പുനരാവർത്തിച്ചു സമയം കളയണമെന്നു ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നില്ല. കല്ലാർ സ്കീമിനെപ്പറ്റി പൊതുജനങ്ങൾക്ക് ആദ്യമായി അറിയാൻ ഇടവന്നതു പത്രങ്ങളിൽ നിന്നാണ്. അകാലത്തു ഈ സംഗതിയെപ്പറ്റി ശരിയായ ഒരു അഭിപ്രായം രൂപീകരിക്കാൻ അവക്കസാധിച്ചിട്ടില്ല. അതിൽപിന്നീട് ഗവർണ്മെന്റിൽനിന്നു പ്രസ്തുതപ്പെട്ടതീട്ടുള്ള റിക്കാർട്ടുകളും അതിലേയ്ക്കു അവരെ സഹായിച്ചിട്ടില്ലെന്നു മാത്രമല്ല

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai.]

അവരുടെ അഭിപ്രായങ്ങളെ കുഴപ്പത്തിലാക്കുകയാണ് ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളത്. കല്ലാർ സ്കീമിനെപ്പറ്റി ഇന്നലെ ഞങ്ങളെ ഏല്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള എഴുത്തുകുത്തുകൾ, വിഷമാവസ്ഥയിലാക്കിട്ടുള്ള ഞങ്ങളുടെ അഭിപ്രായങ്ങളെ അതിൽ ഉറപ്പിക്കുകയാണ് ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളത്. ഇതിലേക്ക കാരണമില്ലാതെയില്ല. കണ്ണൻദേവൻ കൺസഷൻ, പെരിയാർ പ്രീസ് മുതലായി, ഈ ഗവർണ്മെൻറിൽനിന്നു മുമ്പെ ഇടപെട്ടിട്ടുള്ള പലേ സംഗതികളും കല്ലാർ സ്കീമിനെസംബന്ധിച്ചു പലേ തെറ്റിദ്ധാരണകൾക്കും വേണ്ടപോലെ സഹായിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. കല്ലാർ സ്കീമിനെപ്പറ്റി നടത്തീട്ടുള്ള എഴുത്തുകുത്തുകളിൽ വിദഗ്ദ്ധാഭിപ്രായങ്ങൾ യോജിക്കാതെയിരിക്കുന്നു. ഈ അഭിപ്രായവ്യത്യാസങ്ങളെ വാളങ്ങളെക്കുണ്ട് ആരംഭത്തിനു തൃപ്തികരമായി ഖണ്ഡിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതായി കാണുന്നില്ല. ചീഫ് ഇഞ്ചിനിയർ മിസ്റ്റർ ജേക്കബ് ആദ്യകാലം ഗവർൺമെൻറിനോട് ഉപദേശിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതിനു അനുകൂലമായിട്ടല്ല രണ്ടാമതു കല്ലാർ സ്കീമിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു ഗവർൺമെൻറിനോടു ശുപാർശ ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളതെന്നു എഴുത്തുകുത്തുകളിൽനിന്നു കാണുന്നു. ദിവാൻജിമാരായ മിസ്റ്റർ പി. രാജഗോപാലാചാരി, ദിവാൻ ബഹദൂർ എം. കൃഷ്ണൻനായർ ഇവരുടെയും ചീഫ് ഇഞ്ചിനിയരായിരുന്ന മിസ്റ്റർ ബാസ്റ്റ്യായുടെയും അഭിപ്രായങ്ങളെ തക്കതായ കാരണങ്ങളെക്കൊണ്ടു തൃപ്തികരമായ വിധം ഖണ്ഡിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതായി റിക്കാർട്ടുകളിൽനിന്നും കാണാൻ സാധിച്ചിട്ടില്ലെന്നുള്ളസംഗതി എത്രയോ ഗൌരവമുള്ളതാണെന്നു പറയാതെതരമില്ല. ഈ സ്ഥിതിയിൽ കല്ലാർസ്കീമിനെപ്പറ്റി ആൽപ്രഡ് ഡിക്കിൻസൺ കമ്പനിയുടെ പ്രാരംഭറിപ്പോർട്ട് കണ്ടതിനുമേൽ ഈ ജോലി തിരുവിതാംകൂറിന് എത്രത്തോളം അനുകൂലമായിത്തീരുമെന്നു വേണ്ടപോലെ ആലോചിച്ചു തീരുമാനിക്കേണ്ടതാണെന്നുള്ള മിസ്റ്റർ പരമേശ്വരൻപിള്ളയുടെ പ്രമേയം എത്രയോ ന്യായമായിട്ടുള്ളതാണ്. കല്ലാറിലെ വെള്ളം മധുരയിലെ കൃഷിക്ക് ഉപയോഗപ്പെടുമെന്നുള്ള സ്ഥിതിക്ക അതിലേക്ക ബ്രിട്ടീഷുഗവർൺമെൻറിൽനിന്നും നഷ്ടക്കരാറുണ്ടാക്കുന്ന ആദായത്തെ മുമ്പേകൂട്ടി നിശ്ചയിക്കുന്നതിൽ ആക്ഷേപമുള്ളതല്ല. ന്യായമായ കാരണങ്ങളെ അടിസ്ഥാനമാക്കിക്കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ള ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ അനുകൂലിക്കാൻ ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട എല്ലാ മെംബറന്മാരും തയ്യാറായിരിക്കുമെന്നാണ് എന്റെ വിശ്വാസം.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Sir, the Resolution before the House is a very simple and, as it appears to me, a reasonable one. The ostensible issue in the discussion relates to the production of electric power for purposes of industry in the State. But a number of collateral issues overtopping the frontal question arise in this connection and seem to complicate the discussion. The points urged by the mover and the supporter of the Resolution have not been met by the professor-member in charge of the Government's view in this debate.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: May I ask the member in this connection what particular points according to him have not been met by me?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: The official spokesman did not face any of the points raised. For example, the possible detriment to agriculture, the inrush of salt water, the uncertainty of the terms for the agreement, were all referred to and they remain unanswered. The professor-member went on eulogising the generation of electric power and dwelt on the gaudy results thereof in a lengthy speech, no doubt, loaded with much learning and laying down general principles with which no one has any quarrel. The member in charge of the Agricultural Department made a more direct attempt in support of the position of Government,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

but his speech—especially the latter part of it—only confirms one's suspicions and misgivings. He tells us that, from the electrical part of the scheme he hopes we shall be able to realise something because Messrs. Alfred Dickinson Co. is a great name. Now there he asks us to be on uncertain ground. With respect to the other part of the scheme, namely, the diversion of water to British territories, Dr. Kunjan Pillai said that nothing definite could be predicted at this stage. That, according to him, was a matter between the two Governments and nobody can possibly say anything definite. Practically, thus all the misgivings to which expression was given during the course of the debate remain as such. In the absence of definite terms and before weighing the advantages or otherwise of the concern, I fail to see how an agreement may be concluded. In short, the non-official side of the House wants further light on the points raised, and refuses to be led to accept an agreement, with whomsoever be it, in blinkers. Once the water of the Kallar gets diverted to the other side of the Ghats, the Madras Government would be in a position of vantage, and our choice to accept or reject what may be offered as a *quid pro quo* for the water deflected would be something akin to Hobson's choice. All that the Resolution aims at is an investigation of the possibilities of the scheme and a reservation of our freedom to accept or reject the terms offered in the light of such investigation. How can Government possibly object to light being thrown on the situation? With respect to the possible damage to our agriculture, if Government are prepared to rely so strongly on the opinion of their experts, I should like to know whether any one will induce Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. to guarantee the payment of compensation for the damages, if any, that may result from the diversion of Kallar water. I challenge official opinion to come forward to say 'yes' or 'no'. In these circumstances, the Resolution appears most reasonable and I most willingly support it.

MR. M. NILAKANDA PILLAI: Sir, I am afraid that the scope of the Resolution has been misunderstood. I may point out at the very outset that no one is against the investigation of the scheme, but what we insist upon is that we should be definitely told, before we allow the immediate grant of the concession to the Firm to carry out the scheme, how the diversion of water will affect Travancore and, secondly, how the loss, if any, will be compensated. We should have definite and reliable information on these two points. We are now asked to depend for this information entirely on shrewd surmises and the vague statements of some persons. This Resolution says that this is not enough. It is not a small matter that can be disposed of like this in haste. It affects the interests of Travancore, its people and its Government. Two great successive Dewans, namely, Sir P. Rajagopalachari and Dewan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nair, have opposed the scheme with persistence and boldness on the ground that it will affect prejudicially the interests of Travancore. The *pros* and *cons* were then thoroughly discussed between the Madras Government and our Government. All the arguments advanced by the Madras Government were carefully considered

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. M. Nilakanda Pillai.]

and our Government came to the conclusion that the scheme was prejudicial to the interests of Travancore. The Dewan, Sir, now says that these objections were carefully examined. What was that examination? The objections were not trivial and were not advanced by irresponsible persons. The importance of the matter deserves careful examination at the hands of an impartial committee of experts. But nothing like that appears to have been done. On the other hand, what took place was this. Mr. Jacob, the Chief Engineer, was asked by Government on the 1st December, 1921, to favour Government with his own opinions on the objections raised and to *meet* those objections. Mark the word 'meet'. That clearly showed what the Government wanted. They also demanded in that letter a reply within a week, and Mr. Jacob, in commendable obedience to the order, sent up a reply after four days on the 5th December, 1921, meeting those objections. Of course, no one will expect that Mr. Jacob would have gone into the question thoroughly or even properly within such a short time, and that, from Trivandrum. Therefore, it will be no surprise to find that he trotted out the same arguments as were previously advanced by the irrigation expert of the Madras Government, as stated in the letter of the British Resident, dated the 16th June, 1916. A comparison of the wording and the substance of Mr. Jacob's arguments with those contained in that letter will convince any one of the family resemblance. It is nothing surprising to see that, in his hurry and anxiety, Mr. Jacob did not see that the basis of the argument he then advanced was quite contrary to the statements he himself had made earlier after due investigation, and that those arguments had been most satisfactorily met by the Travancore Government in their letter to the Resident, dated the 1st November, 1916. The argument which he advanced to show that the quantity of water that might be withdrawn from the Periyar river by the diversion of Kallar water would only be slight, was based on the assumption that the rainfall of the place would only be 99·5 inches, while the investigation—let it be meagre—conducted by the Travancore Government in 1916 and earlier showed a rainfall of 140 to 200 inches, and the investigation conducted by Mr. Jacob himself, two years after this point was questioned by the Madras Government, enabled him to say in his letter to Government on the 30th April, 1919, that the rainfall was about 200 to 300 inches a year. Are we to accept the opinion of a person like this who is prepared to eat his own words at a moment's notice? And yet, Sir, the Government are prepared to say that this question has been carefully examined. Did the Dewan ask the Director of Agriculture to report on the irrigational possibilities of the Kallar water? The Dewan says in the Press Communiqué that the Director is of opinion that this diversion will not materially affect cultivation in Travancore. The Government, it seems, base this remark on a stray answer which he gave casually to an inquisitive questioner at the second meeting of the conference which was held at the instance of the Government to ascertain whether their belief that

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the scheme was a profitable concern to Travancore was also the opinion of the conference. The letter of the Government to the President of the Development Board just before the meeting would show this. Sir, we shall be failing in our duty and responsibility to our constituencies, if we allow this kind of make-beliefs to be substituted for a searching examination by a body of experts. Let us first be convinced that the diversion of Kallar water will not prejudicially affect Travancore, by the considered report of such a body.

If it is proved that the diversion will not cause a substantial loss to the State, we shall then proceed to know what exactly we may hope to get from this concern and whether it will be a sufficient compensation for the loss, whatever that may be. The British Resident himself points out in his letter dated the 14th November, 1916, that the construction of a power house on the eastern side of the Ghats will not be of much use to Travancore in respect of electricity. (*Vide* page 75 of the important papers.) So we need not depend on the scheme for our electricity. For that, there are other falls in Travancore which are situated more advantageously in this respect and which, if tapped, would therefore give power at cheaper rates to Travancore. We need not look to this scheme for power. Mr. John Kurien and other experienced men have also endorsed this opinion. (*Vide* Mr. Kurien's remarks at the second meeting of the conference.) Moreover, we have yet to create a demand for power in Travancore. Let us, therefore, try to get our dues in terms of money. We should try to get something as royalty for every unit of power generated and for every unit of water let out. We do not know now what we may get from this. Acceptance of the principle of payment by the Madras Government is not at all sufficient. We should ascertain specifically what they would pay. This, they say, they can do only after investigation. So let us wait till the investigation report is received and till we know definitely what we may get for our power and water. An impression is gaining ground that the British Government is bringing its great influence to bear on our Government who are thus being forced to grant the concession. That impression gets confirmation from the great anxiety and haste exhibited by the Government in dealing with this subject. Sir, there is no need for this hurry. The water wealth will not deteriorate. Let us proceed slowly after due and deliberate consideration. With these words, I support the Resolution.

MR. P. PARAMESVARAN: കല്ലാർ സ്കീമിന്റെ ഉപയോഗത്തെ പറ്റി അനേകം മാന്യസ്നേഹിതന്മാർ പറഞ്ഞുകഴിഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നസ്ഥിതിക്ക് അതിനെപ്പറ്റി അധികമായി ഞാൻ വിവരിക്കുന്നില്ല. തിരുവിതാംകൂർ സംസ്ഥാനത്തിൽ ഉള്ളതും ഒരു നാട്ടിന്റെ സ്വത്തും ആയവെള്ളത്തെ മറുനാട്ടിലേയ്ക്കു കൊണ്ടുപോയാൽ അല്ലാതെ അത് ഉപയോഗപ്പെടുകയില്ല എന്ന് ഒരു രാജ്യത്തിലെ ഇഞ്ചിനീയർ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരും മറുരാജ്യങ്ങളിലെ ഇഞ്ചിനീയർ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരും അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നതായികാണുന്നു. നമ്മുടെ രാജ്യത്തിൽവ്യവസായങ്ങളെപോഷിപ്പിക്കുന്നതിനു വിദ്യുച്ഛക്തിഅത്യാവശ്യകമാണ്. ഒരു വിദ്യുച്ഛക്തിഇപ്പോൾ വാഴവിഷയമായിതീർന്നിരിക്കുന്ന കല്ലാർസ്കീമിൽനിന്നു സുലഭമായി ലഭിക്കാവുന്നതാണെന്നു കണ്ടിരിക്കുന്നു. ഇതുപോലെ ഒരുസ്കീം നടത്തിക്കുന്നതിന് ഒരു കോടിരൂപായ്ക്കു മേൽചിലവുവേണ്ടിവരും. ഗവർണ്മെണ്ടിന്റെ ഇപ്പോഴത്തെനിലയ്ക്കു ഗവ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. P. Parameswaran.]

ർണ്മെണ്ട് തന്നിച്ചാകട്ടെ ഈനാട്ടിലെ ജനങ്ങൾ ഓഹരി എടുത്തിട്ടാകട്ടെ ഇതുപോലെ വലുതായ തുക ശേഖരിച്ച് ഒരു സ്കീം നടത്തുക എന്നുള്ളതു സാദ്ധ്യമായിരിക്കുന്നില്ല. അടുത്ത ആണ്ടിൽ ക്രൻസ് ഡ/സലക്ഷംരൂപാ വരവും ക്രൻസ് ഡ/സ ലക്ഷംരൂപാ ചിലവും ഉണ്ടാകുമെന്ന് ഇന്നലെ ഫിനാൻഷ്യൽ സിക്രട്ടറി പ്രസ്താവിച്ചു. ഇത്രം വിധം വരവും ചിലവും ഉള്ള ഗവർണ്മെണ്ട് ഒരു കോടി രൂപാ ഒരുമിച്ചുകൂടി സംഗതിക്കായി ചിലവാക്കാൻ ഇടയാകുന്നത് എപ്പോൾ?

കല്ലാർ വെള്ളത്തെ ഈ സ്കീമിലെയ്ക്കായി ഉപയോഗിക്കാതെ വച്ചു കൊണ്ടിരുന്നാൽ ഈ നാട്ടിലെയ്ക്ക് യാതൊരു ഗുണവും ഇല്ല എന്നു വിദഗ്ദ്ധൻമാർ അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നു. കല്ലാറു വെള്ളത്തിൽ നൂറിനു നാലുവീതം അംശം കൊണ്ടതായ വെള്ളം മാത്രമെ ഈ സ്കീമിലെയ്ക്കായി ഉപയോഗപ്പെടുത്താൻ പോകുന്നുള്ളൂ. പെരിയാറ് വഴി ഒഴുകി കടലിൽ ഉപയോഗമില്ലാതെ വീഴുന്ന വെള്ളം കുറവുവരുന്നതു കൊണ്ട് യാതൊരു ദോഷവുമില്ല. പെരിയാറിലെ വെള്ളപ്പൊക്കത്താൽ ഇരുകരകളിലുമുള്ള ഭൂമികളിൽ ഉറയുന്ന വണ്ടലുകൾ ആ ഭൂമികൾക്കു നല്ല ഉരമായിത്തീരുന്നുണ്ട് എന്നുവരികിലും കല്ലാറിലെ വെള്ളത്തിൽ ഇരുപത്തഞ്ചിൽ ഒരംശം പുറനാട്ടിലെയ്ക്കു പോയതു കൊണ്ട് ഒരു വണ്ടലിന്റെ വലുതായ കുറവൊന്നും ഉണ്ടാകുന്നതല്ല. പെരിയാറിലെ ഇരുകരകളിലും ഉള്ള ഭൂമികൾ ആണ്ടുതോറും വെള്ളപ്പൊക്കമുണ്ടായി കൃഷി നഷ്ടപ്പെട്ടുവരുന്നുണ്ട്. പെരിയാറിലെ വെള്ളപ്പൊക്കത്തിന്റെ കുറവു വരുത്തുന്നത് ആ ഭൂമികളിലെ കൃഷിക്കാർക്ക് ഗുണകരമായിരിക്കയേ ഉള്ളൂ. അഥവാ വല്ലകുറവും വരുമെന്നു വിചാരിക്കുന്നതായാലും വിളനിലത്തിന്റെ ഉണ്ടായി അനേകവിധവ്യവസായശാലകൾ വഴിച്ച് ഒരു രാജ്യത്തിലെയ്ക്ക് ഐശ്വര്യാഭിവൃദ്ധി ഒരു സ്കീമിൽനിന്നു സാധിക്കുന്നതിനെ നോക്കുമ്പോൾ ആ നഷ്ടം വളരെ തുച്ഛമായിരിക്കും. ഡിക്കിൻസൺ കമ്പനിക്കാർക്ക് ഒരുസ്കീം നടത്തിക്കാൻ അനുവാദം കൊടുക്കുന്നതു കൊണ്ട് ഒരുസംസ്ഥാനത്തിലെയ്ക്ക് അനേകവിധമായ ഗുണങ്ങളും ശ്രേയസ്സുകളും ലാഭവും ജനിക്കുമെന്ന് ഒരു സഭയിലെ മാന്യമെംബറായ മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. വി. കൃഷ്ണയ്യങ്കാർ ഇതിനു മുമ്പിലെ അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നു. ഒരു സ്കീം നിമിത്തം തിരുവിതാംകൂറിനു യാതൊരു നഷ്ടവും ഇല്ല എന്നു തന്നെയല്ല വലുതായ ഗുണം സിദ്ധിക്കുമെന്നു മറ്റൊരു മാന്യമെംബർ മിസ്റ്റർ മാമ്മൻ മാപ്പിളയും ഇതിനു മുമ്പിലെ പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നു.

ഒടുവിൽ നിശ്ചയിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന എഗ്രിമെന്റിന്റെ പ്രകാരം ഒരു സ്കീമിന്റെ പരിശോധനയ്ക്കായി പോലും യാതൊരു പണവും ഗവർണ്മെണ്ടു ചിലവാക്കേണ്ടിവരികയില്ല. സകല ചിലവുകളും കമ്പനിക്കാർ വഹിച്ചു കൊള്ളുന്നു. അതിലെയ്ക്കു കൂടികളുടെ പേരിൽ പതിയാത്ത ഭൂമികൾ കമ്പനിക്കു കൊടുക്കേണ്ടിയിരുന്നാൽ അതിലേയ്ക്ക് അവർ സർക്കാർ കരവും തരും. ഇതുപോലെയുള്ള കായ്ങ്ങൾക്കായിട്ടല്ലാതെ സഹ്യപർവ്വതത്തിന്റെ അത്യുന്നതമായ പൊക്കത്തിൽ ഉള്ള ഭൂമികളിൽനിന്നു സർക്കാരിലെയ്ക്കു കരം കിട്ടാൻ ഇടവരുന്നത് എങ്ങനെ?

ഡിക്കിൻസൺ കമ്പനിക്കാർക്ക് ഈ സ്കീമിൽനിന്നു ലാഭം കിട്ടുവാൻ തുടങ്ങുമ്പോൾ ആ ലാഭത്തിൽ ന്യായമായ പങ്കു ഗവൺമെൻറിലേയ്ക്ക് അവർ തരാമെന്നു പറയുന്നുണ്ട്. ഇതിനും പുറമെ മധുരജില്ലയിൽ കൃഷിക്കായി ഈ വെള്ളത്തെ ഉപയോഗിക്കുമ്പോൾ അതിലേയ്ക്കു പ്രതിഫലം ബ്രിട്ടീഷ് ഗവർണ്മെണ്ടിൽ നിന്നും തരാൻ ഭാവമുണ്ട്. ഇങ്ങനെ രണ്ടുവിധത്തിലും സ്ഥിരമായ ആദായം നമുക്കു കിട്ടുന്നു.

ഈ സംസ്ഥാനത്തിലെ ഇഞ്ചിനീയർമാരും കൃഷിഡയറക്ടരും വനം കൺസർവെറരും മറ്റ് അനേകം വിദഗ്ദ്ധന്മാരും ഈ സ്കീമിന് അനുകൂലമായി അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കെ അതിനെ ശീഘ്രം വേഗത്തിൽ നടപ്പാക്കേണ്ടതു ആവശ്യകമാകുന്നു. ഈ സ്കീമിനെ ഉടൻ അനുവദിക്കാതെ താമസിപ്പിച്ചു വച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരുന്നാൽ വലുതായ ദോഷം

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ഉണ്ടെന്നു മിസ്റ്റർ. കുയ്ൻ ഇഞ്ചിനീയർ അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നു. എന്തുകൊണ്ടെന്നാൽ ഇതുപോലെ ഒരു സ്കീം നടത്തുന്നതിനു കൊച്ചീഗവർണ്മെൻറ് ഏർപ്പാടു ചെയ്യുവരുന്നു. അതു നടപ്പിൽ വന്നുപോയാൽ ഈ സ്കീം വിണുപോകും എന്നും അതുകൊണ്ടു ഉടൻ നടത്തിക്കേണ്ടതാണെന്നും അദ്ദേഹം പറയുന്നു.

ഈ സ്കീം നടത്തിക്കുന്ന വകയ്ക്കു ഡിക്കിൻസൺ കമ്പനിക്കാർ സമ്മതിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതായ കരാറുകൾ ഈ ഗവർണ്മെൻറിലേയ്ക്കു വളരെ അനുകൂലമായിരിക്കെ ഈ കൺട്രാക്ട് ആ കമ്പനിക്കു കൊടുത്തില്ലെന്നുവരികിൽ മറ്റു സംസ്ഥാനങ്ങളിൽ ഇതുപോലെ ഒരു സ്കീം നടത്തുന്നതിനായി അവർ പോയ്പോകും. ഇതിലേക്കായി മറ്റൊരു കമ്പനിക്കാരെ അന്വേഷിച്ചു വരുത്തുന്നതും എളുപ്പമല്ല. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഈ സ്കീം അനുവദിക്കേണ്ടതാണെന്നും സ്കീം നടത്തിക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള കൺട്രാക്ട് ഡിക്കിൻസൺ കമ്പനിക്കാക്കു കൊടുക്കണമെന്നും അതിനു കാലതാമസം വരുത്തരുതെന്നും ഞാൻ ബലമായി അഭിപ്രായപ്പെടുന്നു. എൻറെ മാന്യസ്നേഹിതൻ മിസ്റ്റർ. ജി. പരമേശ്വരൻപിള്ള പറഞ്ഞ തക്കം അനുവദിച്ചുകൂടാ, പൂജ്യരായ പ്രസിഡണ്ട് അവർകളെ, ഈ സ്കീം ഉടൻതന്നെ അനുവദിക്കുന്നതു നിമിത്തം കോട്ടയം ആലപ്പുഴ മുതലായി അനേകം മയിൽ അകലെ ഇരിക്കുന്ന നഗരങ്ങളിൽ കൂടിയും പുതുതായ വ്യവസായശാലകൾ ഉണ്ടാകുവാൻ ഇടയാകുമെന്നുള്ളതുകൊണ്ട് അവിടുന്ന് ഈ രാജ്യത്തിലെ പ്രജകളുടെ ഐശ്വര്യാഭിവൃദ്ധി പല ശാഖകളായി പടർന്നു വളരുവാൻ കാരണഭൂതരായി തീരുകയും ചെയ്യും.

MR. N. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI: I beg to offer a few remarks in support of the motion brought by Mr. Parameswaran Pillai. All that the Resolution prays for is that an investigation should be made before Government commit themselves to this scheme. We want something more than the assertions and inferences of the Director of Agriculture who has admittedly not made any investigation either at the Kallar source or along the banks of the Periyar river. How far the extent of reduction in the river water would affect the lands adjoining the river has not yet been investigated. Mr. Bastow says:

"As regards the water, the Travancore and Cochin ryots are at present mainly concerned with flood water on the silt from which the fertility of their fields depends. It is urged that there is plenty of flood water. This is not the way to look at it. It is the height of the flood that counts, and it is poor consolation to a ryot to know that there is plenty of water in the river if the flood falls short of his field by an inch or so. As a matter of fact the amount already withdrawn by the Periyar scheme is enormous and the further decrease contemplated is no small matter."

I think this argument of Mr. Bastow has not been considered by Mr. Jacob as is evident from his view that a slight diminution in the flood will be more beneficial than injurious to the lands on either side. Mr. Jacob thinks that the utility of the flood consists mainly in renewing the fertility of the soil and he apparently ignores the fact that its great usefulness consists in its bringing huge quantities of fertilising silt which are annually deposited on the adjoining lands. The rich cocoanut gardens of Verapuzha, for instance, owe their fertility entirely to the silt that is being annually deposited on the soil during the rainy season. Any decrease in the height of the flood means a corresponding diminution in the area watered and manured by the flood. The injurious effects, like these, of the proposed diversion of water could be gauged only after a careful investigation is made.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. Dominic Tomman.]

In these circumstances, the proposal before the Council praying for an investigation by experts before the Government commit themselves to any scheme is, in my opinion, only fair and just and ought to be accepted by this House. I would give my hearty support to the Resolution brought by Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai.

MR. K. DOMINIC TOMMAN: Sir, the Kallar river has its source to the north of Kumili and it runs north close to the eastern border of Travancore through the Amaravati Reserve Forest until it turns west, a few miles distant from the place where the proposed dam is to be built. The nature of the land about this part of the Kallar is such that there is little possibility of this portion of its water being utilised for irrigation purposes in the State. The catchment area of this portion compared with the total catchment area of the Periyar is so small that there will not be any appreciable diminution in the latter river's volume of water. I should, therefore, think that Travancore is not going to suffer in any way by the diversion of this portion of the Kallar water to the Madura District. I am also of opinion that there is very little possibility in the near future of our raising the necessary funds for working the scheme ourselves. It seems to me, therefore, that the question which should engage our best deliberation is how the concesssion may be granted in the best interests of our country.

Apart from the profit which we may get from the Company, the chief source of income to this Government will be the remuneration to be given to us by the Madras Government for the water supplied to them. In the letter to the Resident dated the 19th December, 1921, the Government wanted to know whether the Madras Government would purchase the water and, if so, at what rate, or whether they proposed to permit the Company to sell the water to the ryots. The intention of the Government appears, at that time, to have been to come to some definite understanding with the Madras Government in the matter of the disposal of the water, before they entered into any agreement with the Company. Although it is said in the Resident's reply dated the 12th May, 1922, that the Madras Government agreed to the principle of payment for water used for irrigation, the amount and manner of payment is left to be settled by negotiation after a detailed investigation. According to the Press Communiqué now issued, the contract with the Company is to be immediately executed and the remuneration from the Madras Government left to be settled by subsequent negotiations.

The catchment area of the proposed lake covers 73 square miles or about 30,000 acres. This is not a first class reserve, since there is not much tree-growth in it; but it is useful for tea and paddy cultivation. In the original Cardamom Hills Project, the Madras Government had no objection to the assigning of the catchment area for cultivation. (*Vide* page 2 of the Press Communiqué.) In Proposal A, the Company wants this Government to reserve the catchment

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

area of the lake, etc. We shall not, therefore, be able to utilise this area for any cultivation even if we so desire. The area proposed to be irrigated in the Madura District by the water diverted from the Kallar is about 20,000 acres. Hence the remuneration we may get from the Madras Government will hardly compensate us for keeping idle about 30,000 acres of our land covered by the catchment area.

I consider it will be better, therefore, to stick to the original idea of the Government expressed in their letter to the Resident above referred to, and to execute the contract with the Company only after settling the terms with the Madras Government. I should also think that the terms of the contract with the Company itself could be satisfactorily settled only after a preliminary investigation. I would, therefore, gladly subscribe myself as a supporter of the motion.

MR. M. R. MADHAVA VARIAR: Under Standing Order No. 25, I move that the question be now put.

MR. M. NILAKANDA PILLAI: I second it.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I request that the President may allow some more time to the members.

PRESIDENT: I consider that it will be an infringement of the right of reasonable debate to allow this motion now. There are some more gentlemen who may wish to speak and it may be useful to hear them in coming to a decision on this Resolution. I am not prepared to allow the motion.

MR. K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR: It is open to you, Sir, unless you propose to have the whole question decided to-day, to adjourn the meeting to another day under Section 9 (2) of Regulation II of 1097.

PRESIDENT: I propose to close the business to-day and have the Resolution put to the vote. Most of the points have already been discussed. There may be only a few more speakers and the further discussion will not take us long.

MR. R. EVERARD: Sir, all aspects of the question have been argued upon *in extenso*, and so I shall confine myself only to my professional opinion on the points raised by the member moving the Resolution. Regarding the detrimental effect on the action of the silt-bearing water in the lower reaches of the Periyar river by the diversion of the water from the Kallar basin into the Madura District, I am of opinion, with the late Chief Engineer Mr. Jacob, that the loss of the small quantity of water required for the proposed Hydro-Electric Scheme, out of the total discharge of the Periyar river, cannot materially affect the flooding of the paddy lands below Malayattur. The average rainfall in the Periyar basin from June to November, taken from *ten rainfall stations*, comes to 99·5 inches. This has been obtained from accurate data, the rainfall stations being at Munnar, Devicolam, Peermade, Santhanpara, Pampadanpara, Kumili, Malayattur, Perumpavur, Alwaye and Parur,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. R. Everard.]

The calculated discharge of the Periyar river during these months, excluding the catchment of the Periyar lake, would then be 13,700 *cusecs*. The diversion of the small quantity of water required for the Hydro-Electric Scheme cannot affect this enormous discharge, for even the total run-off from the Kallar basin which is calculated to be 470 *cusecs*, would be only less than 3½ per cent. of the discharge of the Periyar river and would be quite inappreciable.

The other point raised was that the proposed diversion would affect navigation and help the penetration of salt water further up the river during the dry season. The minimum dry weather discharge from the Kallar has been ascertained to be only 10 *cusecs* out of the total dry discharge of 174 *cusecs* from the Periyar. Surely, the loss of such a small quantity as 10 cubic feet per second can have no appreciable effect on the flow of salt water up the river. The minimum flow of 10 *cusecs* was ascertained by Mr. M. P. Mani, Executive Engineer, who inspected the site and actually measured the flow in March, 1919. Going into details, the Periyar river divides itself into two branches below the Alwaye bridge and half of this quantity flows down each branch. If the deep water channel is 150 feet wide and the velocity one foot per second, the depth of the water will be only seven inches and the difference in depth which the ten *cusecs* from the Kallar river will make, when divided between the two branches, would be only ⅓ of an inch.

This, however, is the absolute minimum flow and any one living near Alwaye would know that the river seldom runs so low. Taking the average rainfall from the ten rain gauges mentioned above for the six months from December to May, the calculated *average* dry weather discharge of the Periyar for these six months (from December to May) comes to 1,125 *cusecs*, while that of the Kallar river, from the rain gauge at Pampadanpara alone, which is quite close to the Kallar basin, works up to 45 *cusecs* or 4 per cent. of the total discharge.

The average depth of water, then, during the six dry months in each of the branches of the Periyar below Alwaye (assuming the velocity to be two feet per second) would be 1'-10" and the difference caused by the loss of the Kallar water less than half an inch.

It will be observed, therefore, that the depth in the Periyar river near Alwaye varies from seven inches in the driest month of March to 1'-10", the average dry weather depth, and, as such is the case, I do not see how a small difference of ⅓ to ½ of an inch due to the cutting off of the Kallar water can help the penetration of salt water further up the river.

Also, if, at some future time, it is found necessary to have an irrigation scheme to irrigate lands in Travancore, the dam will have to be located above the irrigable areas, that is, above Malayattur or Tattakad. The objection about the salt water working up and the level of the fertilising floods falling, would then equally apply. It would appear that any

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

scheme proposed would affect the utilisation of the Periyar water. Let us consider the extent of lands now benefited by inundation, for the interest of which we have to give up all our schemes in regard to the Kallar or Periyar rivers. Roughly estimating from the inch to the mile map, the total extent of such land will be 5,000 acres. The question, therefore, is, are we going to give up all our present and future productive schemes out of regard for these five thousand acres?

Mr. Bastow is a very able engineer and the member who moved this Resolution has every reason to give due weight to his remarks. The only motive he can have for his strong protest against the diversion of the water from the Kallar basin is that he was sore over the loss of 230 square miles to Travancore on account of the Periyar Project without an adequate return, and he feared that the 73 square miles comprising the Kallar basin would also be given away in the same manner.

Mr. Bastow after leaving Travancore was employed on the great Hydro-Electric Scheme in Tasmania which has been recently successfully completed, and I feel certain that he would raise no objections now, if the interests of Travancore were properly safeguarded and he were assured of an adequate return from the Madras Government. He says in paragraph 7 of his letter No. 1430, dated the 16th September, 1916, to Government:

"The contention of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation (Madras) that this power cannot be profitably developed *in* Travancore is not at all to the point. Surely, it can be developed *by* Travancore, if ever we need to do so. If in course of time our Government come to the conclusion that they could afford to spare the water to get the power, surely we could arrange to run a power house at Kuruvanath, just as the Madras Government have in the past arranged their Periyar scheme in Travancore."

From the above extract, it will be observed that Mr. Bastow was not against the power scheme, provided it was developed *by* Travancore or *in the interests of* Travancore. His objection was to an outsider coming and squatting on Travancore.

As to the use to which the power can be put, besides the production of cheap manure and for the other industries enumerated at the conference of November, 1921, the power can be used even to run electric railways. 7,000 H. P. will do for running a railway line 100 miles long.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: SIR, when I read Mr. A Narayana Pillai's letter about the Kallar Scheme published in the *Western Star*, I thought he had made out a good case in support of Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai's Resolution. I had half made up my mind to support it. But the Government Communiqué issued yesterday threw, I might say, electric light on the subject quite in consonance with the hydro-electric question, and marshalled the arguments in favour of the scheme in most convincing terms. During my official career I was in Alwaye for three years and had ample opportunities, during my boat journeys, to observe the conditions of low and high water, and, I think I can speak with some personal knowledge of the subject, at least as far as the Periyar river is concerned.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. A. Hoogewerf.]

The British Government in answering the objections of our Government that the working for the exploitation of timber or other forest produce in the catchment area of the proposed reservoir, if leased out, would be greatly hampered, had stated that there would be no restrictions in regard to working the area as a reserved forest. Is it to be presumed that the catchment area can be worked as a reserved forest, under the terms of agreement with the Company also? If the answer is in the affirmative, this objection is disposed of.

There is next the question of cultivation of tea, cardamom, rubber, paddy, etc., in the area, which, when dammed up for the reservoir, will be submerged and become unfit for cultivation. It may be remarked here that most of this area is uncultivable, being rocky and, as just stated by the Conservator of Forests, grassy land. The Communiqué is clear on the subject that such lands will be given to the Company on payment of assessment. This will greatly compensate for any loss of revenue that cardamom and other cultivation would fetch.

There are immense areas available still for cardamom and other cultivation and the leasing out the area cannot, I think, appreciably affect the development of such cultivation, even if, in the near or distant future, there will be prospects for the same.

The next question to be discussed is whether it is possible to utilise the Kallar water either for irrigation or for industrial purposes ourselves. In this connection, it has to be considered whether the financial position of the State will permit us undertaking such a costly scheme at any time. We heard yesterday from the Financial Secretary that it has been just possible to make both ends meet. When we have so many irons already in the fire and ever so many more still to come in, can we throw our money—and that a crore of rupees—on a scheme the success of which is not absolutely certain? The lay of the land, it would appear, does not permit of any extensive irrigation in the tract traversed by the river below the catchment area. As regards the question of generating power, it is admitted on all hands that the other side of the Ghats is far more favourable than our side.

Coming to the objection that the water in the Alwaye river will be diminished by the diversion of Kallar water to the British side, which is the chief objection to the scheme, my humble opinion is that there will be no appreciable difference by such a diversion. Much is made of Mr. Jacob replying to the Government's letter in four days' time, and unkind conclusions are drawn. Is it not possible that Mr. Jacob had studied this important subject, which has been on the *tapis* for some time now, and was in a position to answer the Government's letter as soon as it was received?

To return, those who raise this objection contend that irrigation would suffer by diminution of water; inasmuch as the flood will not be high enough to deposit silt on the higher levels of cultivation. The next objection is that more salt water would penetrate higher up into the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Alwaye river. The floods depend a great deal upon the rainfall. If the rainfall is heavy, there will be sufficient flood from the Periyar itself for all purposes, even without the Kallar feeding it.

The question of silt deposit, therefore, has to be considered only when the rainfall is not heavy. As a matter of fact, the banks of the Alwaye river are high in most parts, and it is mostly towards the mouth that the banks are low. Therefore, the flood water does not inundate all the area along the course of the river, but mostly in the lower reaches. High floods, while certainly helping cultivation by depositing silt, also do the work of destruction. It often scours the banks and destroys cultivation. I have seen the great poverty and distress prevailing and the havoc it plays on cultivation in the country under flood. So, high floods are not unmixed blessings. Coming to the question of penetration of saline water, it is very inappreciable. Granting even that it is not so, does it materially affect cultivation? Cocoanut cultivation certainly will not be affected, if it is not to be benefited by it, and it is cocoanut which is in abundance in the low-lying banks of the river. The difficulty of saline water penetrating comes in only during the dry weather. The question now to be considered is whether paddy cultivation or sugar-cane cultivation going on on the banks of the Alwaye river will be affected, in case saline water comes up a little higher. The paddy fields lying adjacent to the river bed and almost on a level with it are the only portions which may be affected. These are properly bunded up and saline water will not find its way in, of itself. In regard to the paddy fields and sugar-cane cultivation on the banks, both high and low, which have to be irrigated by baling up water from the river, it has to be mentioned that it is only during ebb or low tide when salt water runs out and fresh water flows downwards, that the baling up is usually done. This, I think, meets the difficulty that has been presented in regard to the saline water.

The present Resolution is a postponement of any agreement being entered into with the Company till the Company themselves make an experiment and find it to be successful. I cannot understand what difference it will make whether we enter into the agreement just now, or after the experiment is made. How will it improve matters? We do not spend a single pie on the experiment. It is undertaken entirely by the Company and they do so on the conviction that it will be a success. If it is a failure, we do not stand to lose. It will be *in statu quo*. There is a *meum* and *tuum* in every transaction. So, is it not hard on the other side that they should make all the experiment, at such heavy cost, without some sort of assurance that our Government would come to terms with them in the end, especially as we can purchase the whole concern after the lapse of 40 years?

There is electric power, as much as we would require, to be sold to us at reasonable rates, which must help to develop our industries a great way. With the coming of electric power, industries will follow. A great deal of water has flowed under the bridge since Mr. Bastow left us. But we just heard from Mr. Everard that Mr. Bastow's conclusions on

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. C. J. Kurien.]

the present scheme were obsessed by his sad experience of the Periyar Project and that, as he is just now engaged in working a big electric scheme in Australia, he would surely recommend the scheme, if his opinion is now asked. It is urged that a committee of enquiry should be appointed. Our officers and those who had taken pains to understand the question have all spoken in favour of the scheme. Every precaution has been already taken and, I am sure, will be taken to safeguard our interests. If we, at any time, require water for purposes of irrigation of the upper reaches, there is enough and more of it in the catchment area.

Government, as far as I see, have looked at all the aspects of the question and have left no stone unturned to guard the country's interests. I think our interests are absolutely safe in the hands of the present Dewan. Charity, no doubt, begins at home, but charity is also our household divinity, and we can afford to practise that charity, especially when it is to our advantage.

These are some of the aspects of the question which I have been able to note down after carefully perusing the Government Communiqué and I leave it to the Council to dispassionately consider the whole question and vote on the Resolution.

Mr. C. J. KURIEN: Sir, The main argument of some of the speakers on this side of the House in support of the Resolution of Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai seems to be based on the opinion of Mr. Bastow that cultivation in Travancore will be prejudicially affected by the diversion of the Periyar water into the British side. I am sure that nobody who has an interest at heart in the welfare of Travancore will fail to oppose such diversion, if it would affect her cultivation. Now let us see, of all the taluks in Travancore, what are the taluks through which the Periyar river flows. Everybody knows and Mr. A. Govinda Menon who is a native of Kunnatnad has certified that the Periyar flows through the taluks of Kunnatnad, Alangad and Parur. It is also a well-known fact that the major portions of the areas of the former two taluks are hilly and elevated where the Periyar water does not reach and that infinitesimal portions alone in the above taluks are under cultivation. Before the construction of the Periyar dam, the very large volume of water that is now impounded in the Periyar lake was running down to the sea. Although such a large volume is always locked up in the above lake, still the cultivation in the above taluks is invariably destroyed by superfluity of water. For, when the sowing of *virippu* cultivation for the Kanni crop is over, the south-west monsoon sets in, the Periyar river is flooded, its banks overflow and the lands under cultivation are submerged for a number of days, so much so that cultivation to a very great extent is destroyed to the sad disappointment of the ryots. On the other hand, if there be a diminution of water that would help to prevent the destruction of their cultivation, the ryots in those taluks would consider it a great boon to them. Thus it will be seen that it is superfluity and not diminution of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

water in the Periyar river that will seriously affect cultivation, and that too, only in two taluks of Travancore. The ryots would welcome a diminution which they consider very essential for the successful cultivation of their lands. I need hardly say that no diminution of water can be effected, unless a diversion of the same from the uppermost part of the river is created.

Another argument raised by some of the speakers in support of the Resolution is that, by the diminution of water in the Periyar river, brackish water from the sea will flow into the river and destroy cultivation. Brackish water generally begins to rise in the month of Dhanu or Makaram when the water in the river will be reduced to a very low level and both banks will then be about 15 to 20 feet high. It will, therefore, be impossible for the salt water to do any harm to the cultivation for the Makaram crop.

Again, as the tracts lying between the Periyar lake and the green line of cultivation are declared to be hilly and rocky, the argument that those parts can be converted into cultivable lands by irrigation projects has no ground to stand upon.

Under all these circumstances, the contention that any diversion of the Periyar water will prejudicially affect cultivation in Travancore is not sustainable. I am, therefore, of opinion that, by the contemplated diversion of the Kallar water, there are many advantages in store for our State. It will diminish the water in the Periyar river and thereby enable the ryots of Kunnatnad and Alangad to cultivate their lands without failure; and it will turn out to be a source of large revenue to the State, as our water will be paid for by the British Government. Further, a European Company of great repute has come forward offering us electricity at a very cheap rate and promising many other favourable concessions, if our Government would permit them to utilise the Kallar water for electric installation. These are the many advantages for Travancore that would accrue by granting permission for the diversion of the Kallar water to the British District. But some of the speakers seem to think that permission to the above Company to start work cannot be given before arriving at some understanding with the British Government as to the rate at which they would pay for our water. I am of opinion that, Travancore being a Protected State and the British Government the Paramount Power which is always expected to safeguard the interests of the States under its protection, we may safely leave the matter in the hands of both our Government and the British Government so as to arrive at a decision that will be advantageous to Travancore.

I would, therefore, request, you, Sir, to see that the negotiations with the said Company are concluded in double quick time.

MR. P. V. DANIEL: Sir, I am of opinion that the scheme should be carried through without any delay.

Any preliminary investigation such as the one contemplated by Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai in his Resolution must necessarily involve a large expenditure and much delay. Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. P. V. Daniel.]

would never make the required investigation, unless they get a definite assurance from the State to the effect that authority would be given them to construct the work or that, in case our State undertakes to work out the scheme, they would be appointed as the consulting engineers on a remuneration fixed in accordance with the practice of the profession as laid down by the Institute of Civil Engineers. It is not possible to ascertain with any certainty the time this investigation would occupy and the cost it would involve.

From the records kindly placed before us by the Government, we find an assurance to the effect that, on a preliminary consideration of the possibilities of utilising the water from the Kallar river, a scheme can be devised to yield over 20,000 H. P. continuously. We are further assured that the Company would give the power which our State requires on very favourable terms. There is, in addition to these, the assurance that our State shall get a fair share in the profits of the Company and a decent payment for the water used for irrigation in British India. It is not possible to generate the power anywhere in Travancore, by the use of wood, coal or oil, at such low rates as are offered by the Company. With the help of the power thus generated and received into our State, streets can be lighted, oils, soaps and manure can be manufactured, and various other industries may be developed. The power may further be sold to private mills and factories which exist now and which may come into existence hereafter.

The Director of Agriculture and Fisheries of our State has stated that it is possible to undertake the manufacture in Travancore of such good fertilisers as nitrate of lime, calcium cyanamide, etc., if the scheme proposed by Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. is carried out, and that, as regards the demands for these fertilisers, there need be no anxiety as they would find a ready sale not only in Travancore but throughout India and Ceylon and in some other countries as well. The supply of cheap and useful manure is an absolute necessity for our country. Since the construction of the Pachipara Dam and the consequent increase in the area of wet lands in South Travanore, the scarcity of manure has been very seriously felt. The crop every year is becoming very poor.

The late Chief Engineer, Mr. Jacob, has stated that the future development of irrigation in North Travancore might be protected by the introduction of sluices in the proposed dam and that he had no doubt whatever of the possibilities of the power being fully utilised. Mr. Everard, the present Chief Engineer, is of opinion that the contemplated diversion of Kallar water would not materially affect our cultivation.

The Conservator of Forests has said that there is very little wet cultivation on the delta of the Periyar, that the possible decrease in the accumulation of silt on wet lands could not be a matefial objection and that a reduction in the flood would only be a source of benefit to cultivation, since the crops often suffered from excess of flood. Now a

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

small decrease in the volume of Periyar water and a lesser deposit of silt on wet lands are not by themselves sufficient to justify the sacrifice of substantial advantages the State would derive.

The catchment area of the lake would be nearly 73 square miles. The Conservator of Forests has stated that this area consists only of grassy lands and that they are now included in the reserved forests. He does not raise any objection to maintaining these lands as they are. It has been said that, if the lands were registered, the lake would gradually silt up and that the capacity of the lake and the volume of water available for irrigation would diminish. In the interests of our country, it is further absolutely necessary to maintain certain forests in the High Range.

Mr. John Kurien, one of our experienced engineers, is of opinion that there is great danger in postponing the investigation of the Kallar Scheme, because the neighbouring State of Cochin has under contemplation a Hydro-Electric Scheme of its own, and that, if we drop the scheme now, it would not be possible for us to find a market for our electric power.

Another favourable term proposed by the Company is that, on the expiration of 40 years from the commencement of the supply of electric energy and of each subsequent period of ten years, our State has the right to purchase the undertaking as a whole, the purchase price being the value of the undertaking as a going concern. Forty or fifty years in the life of a State is but a short period and one need not be anxious about it.

The scheme under consideration is a big undertaking and one of considerable importance to our country. Water-power is of course a national asset and should be developed *by* the State and *for* the State. But it would remain valueless without the investment of a large capital. It would indeed be a great blessing if a combined power and irrigation scheme beneficial to our country could be worked out by our country in our country itself. But, when once we find that, at present or at any time hereafter which could not, with any certainty, be ascertained, it is not possible for our State or for our people to work out the scheme and that it is also not possible to do it by raising foreign capital on favourable terms in view of the world-wide financial depression and uncertainty existing at present, why should the scheme be dropped once more? In a matter like this, will the Company or a set of experts, within a limited time and at a fixed cost, be able to place before us *true* and *accurate* facts and figures which would help us in solving the difficulties we anticipate? We have been warned on all sides that delay is dangerous. Is it not advisable then to permit the Company to carry out the scheme, when our State has not to face any risk or lose anything?

If, in course of time, our State is able to save large sums of money, we or the future generation will never have the occasion to feel sorry for this, since such sums could be utilised for several other useful purposes which exist now and which may come into existence hereafter.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. V Subba Aiyar.]

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: With reference to Mr. N Padmanabha Pillai's observation on the point of law raised, it is rather difficult to answer it without sufficient data. Now, with reference to the rights of adjacent riparian land owners, whether they are different States or different individual owners, every riparian owner has got a right to the use of the water for *natural* purposes. The question raised by the member will depend upon whether there will be any material diminution in the flow of water. Whether Cochin has got a right at all to use for irrigation purposes the water in the Periyar and, if so, whether there will be a material diminution in such water and whether the water will not be more than enough for irrigation purposes, all these factors will have to be taken into consideration before deciding the question.

MR. N. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Has the member any authority to quote?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: I did not expect that Mr. Padmanabha Pillai would raise such a point in the debate. Therefore, I have not brought the authority; but if the member will please refer to any book on "Waters", he will find that ordinarily every riparian owner has got a right to use the water for natural purposes. The question will depend upon what are natural purposes. Irrigation purposes are natural purposes. Now, in the case of Cochin, whether the water has been used for irrigation purposes and whether the water still left in the Periyar after diversion for the proposed scheme will not be more than enough will have to be considered before deciding the question. From what I have been able to gather from the printed papers, it is clear that the amount of water that is likely to be diverted is so insignificantly small that nobody can and will possibly complain of it, and Cochin, if at all, can only have some advantage. I do not believe anybody has till now raised the question whether Cochin has got a right. That question we may leave out of consideration for the present. Cochin knows that negotiations are going on between the Travancore Government and the Company and I do not believe she will be sleeping over her rights if she has any. We may leave Cochin to take care of herself.

Passing on to the issues under debate, I beg to submit, with all deference to the learned member who moved the Resolution and the members on the other side of the House who supported him, that they were really beside the real issue in the case. We will see how the Resolution stands. Clause (*a*) as amended runs as follows:

"That this Council recommends to Government—

(*a*) that, in regard to the Kallar Hydro-Electric Scheme now under the consideration of Government, no assurance should be held out to Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. that they will be granted such permission, facilities and concessions as have been prayed for by them to construct and carry out the scheme, until the Council have had an opportunity of examining the report of any preliminary investigation that the Company may be permitted to undertake in this behalf and of ascertaining in what way and to what extent the State stood to benefit by the said project".

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Now, what the Resolution, so far as clause (*a*) is concerned, wants is that we must wait until Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. make an investigation and submit a preliminary report. What will be the sort of investigation that Messrs. Dickinson & Co. are likely to make? What is the sort of report that we may expect? They may investigate the question what the dam is likely to cost, what quantity of electricity will be generated and what will be the working expenses and above all whether they can launch the scheme on a commercial basis so as to get a profit. How is it going to help us? The offer of Messrs. Dickinson & Co. is that they will supply us with electricity at 6 pies at the generating station. They will also give us one-third of the quantity of electricity generated and they will in addition give us a portion of the profit. Now, so far as these are concerned, there cannot, under any circumstances, be any alteration, because the investigation will not help us further than that. If my friends on the other side have any objection to the term of years intended to be allowed to the Company, I would refer them to the Electricity Regulation itself. It says that a Company should have the privilege of working the scheme for 50 years. That is the maximum period stated in the Regulation. A Company is given 50 years or any sufficiently long period, because in the case of every undertaking, for the first few years or so ,the Company would be working at a loss. It is only later on that profits are likely to accrue. If it is a profitable concern, there is a condition that we have got a right to purchase it. We may, for instance, take the case of Messrs. Crompton & Co., who have been supplying electrical energy in various parts of the Presidency, and I believe they have undertaken to supply British Cochin also. If one would read the British Indian Act or the rules framed thereunder or our Regulation, one would find that the minimum charge for a unit of electricity is not less and, I believe, in Cochin, the rate is likely to be 7 annas. When before the Electricity Regulation was promulgated Mr. Padmanabha Rao offered to supply electricity, his offer was, I believe, to supply at 8 annas and, if I remember aright, he ultimately agreed to 7 annas per unit. In certain cases, the price that one has to pay per unit of electricity will be a little less, probably 6 annas. Now what is the rate offered by Messrs. Dickinson & Co.? They offer to supply electricity at Kottayam, according to the printed papers, 10 pies per unit, and I believe that, if it is taken to Trivandrum which is about 97 miles in a straight line from the generating station, the price will not be possibly more than 1½ or 2 annas. Thus with all deference to the non-official members, I would say that that is a sufficient consideration for anybody who wants the use of electricity, because nobody can possibly produce to supply it at anything less. That is the main consideration and this has not been taken note of by the members on the other side. Now, let us take it for granted that we accept clause (*a*). What is the result? We must wait to see whether the scheme is going to be profitable or not. Beyond that, the Company will not say that Travancore will suffer on account of want of water for irrigation or the inrush of brackish water. They will not say that our lands will be submerged. They will say what the cost of generating electricity is

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. V. Subba Aiyar.]

likely to be and whether the concern is likely to be a good or a bad one. Such an investigation will not help us in any way.

Ignoring this aspect of the question, the first part of the Resolution says: "We must wait". With due deference to the members on the other side of the House, I would say that it will land us in difficulties. It will be absolutely useless to wait for their preliminary investigation. The question for us will be whether, if the scheme is pushed through, our irrigation will be prejudically affected. Reliance was placed in the course of the discussion upon Mr. Bastow's opinion and I have got very great regard for him and his successors whom I have known personally. I would certainly give very great value to their opinions, as I do give to the opinions of eminent lawyers. If lawyers do differ, I believe everybody knows in ordinary practice that the opinion of a lawyer who has gone into the facts of the case and given reasons for coming to a conclusion will be accepted rather than the opinion of one who does not give any data whatsoever and whose opinion it is not possible to judge as either right or wrong and therefore cannot be accepted at all. I appeal to the House on this aspect of the question, because I believe many of the members who have spoken are my lawyer friends. If, in arguing a case, we rely on a particular case decided by a High Court, say the Allahabad High Court on any other High Court, the Judges will naturally ask if the court has given any reasons, and see whether the reasons can be accepted. So also, in this particular case a decision supported by reasons will be preferred to one containing no reason whatever. Mr. Bastow may have had his own reasons for the view that he took. Mr. Everard has suggested what his view might have been. He has suggested that Mr. Bastow did not want that the Madras Government should take up the scheme and that he therefore wanted to give the scheme the go-by.

There the matter ended; but what is our position now? We are here to deal with a Company practically under the Electricity Regulation. The Company offers to supply electricty and wants certain terms. The question is whether we will accept them or not now. Mr. Mammen Mappillai has said—Mr. Jacob, Mr. Everard and Mr. Kurien have said the same thing—that the area is hilly, and that there is no chance of any appreciable extent of land fit for being brought under an irrigation scheme below the proposed dam. No member has said anything to the contrary. I do not see how we can ignore Mr. Jacob's opinion when he gives facts and figures to support it. There is another question, *viz.*, whether cultivation will be seriously affected or not on account of brackish water. If we want to use the water for irrigation purposes, I believe the engineering authorities will take good care about it and see that we are not seriously affected. There is one other matter that I wish to bring to the notice of the Council and it is this. Whatever scheme we may launch upon, we must always be prepared to expect that somebody is likely to be aggrieved to some extent. Let us take, for instance, the question of roads pleaded for by members of the Sri Mulam Popular Assembly.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

As a result of representations, Government grant a road and the engineers settle an alignment, and the work is about to be begun. It is a matter of ordinary knowledge that somebody will come forward and say, although he will be one of the persons benefited by the road: 'The line ought not to pass through my land.' In such cases, what is it that we have to take into consideration? There is no such thing as absolute good or absolute evil in this world. In such cases we should see whether the circumstances which are in our favour far outweigh the circumstances against the scheme. If the advantages do outweigh the disadvantages, certainly the scheme has to be started. One member's objection on the other side was that the Madras Government have not definitely stated what they are going to pay. So far as that matter goes, I do not think that the draft agreement with the Company is ready or that the agreement is to be incorporated in stamp paper to-morrow, but the Government may be safely trusted to see that all the necessary conditions and safeguards are incorporated in the agreement with the Company. In the meantime the Government may correspond with the British Government and come to a settlement, if possible. The question is whether a further investigation should be insisted upon and nobody seems to have suggested what the cost of such a scheme will be. Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. will have to be paid Rs. 75,000, and we will have to lose that amount in case of failure. That being the case, if we do not come to any conclusion now, we may have to wait for ever so many years, and further, if we postpone the scheme for further investigation with a view to the scheme being worked by the State itself, we do not know whether it will be profitable or not. When there are so many prayers of the people that the State money should be utilised for other and more urgent purposes, it is inexpedient that we should spend money on this scheme ourselves. So far as the Company is concerned, it is prepared to take the risk. I do not see why we should forego this advantage. Clause (*b*) of the Resolution relates to the appointment of an expert Committee. My friends would not accept the opinion of Mr. Everard or of Mr. Jacob. We are not told what the constitution of the Committee of experts is to be and what the cost is likely to be. We have no idea whatsoever. We are not told whether we should go in for experts in Travancore or outside Travancore. If, as was suggested, we invite Sir M. Visvesvaraya, we are reckoning without the host. Will he be available? Will he undertake the work? What is the cost likely to be and what will Sir Visvesvaraya and his colleagues charge? All these are absolutely unknown. The member who moved the amendment did not give any data. We have no other information. The Resolution is very vague. With all deference to the members on the other side of the House, that clause of the Resolution should be absolutely negatived, as we have no information on the points mentioned above. With these words, I beg to oppose the Resolution.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Sir, I have to offer only a few words by way of reply. So far as my non-official colleagues are concerned, most of them who spoke on the subject have agreed with me,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. G. Parameswaran Pillai.]

and of those who have not agreed with me most have accepted my motion to some extent. I find that there is only a single point of difference between them and myself. My point was, before proceeding with the negotiations regarding the scheme, let us have a preliminary investigation and let us await its result before we settle the terms thereof. So far as my non-official friends opposite are concerned, they say that it is essential that the rate for the water that is let out into the British Territory from Travancore should be ascertained before the contract is entered into finally. Now, according to me also that is one of the points. According to the proposals made by the Company (as appended to the Press Communiqué) and according to the position accepted by Government in regard to the above proposals, it is seen that you have to fix the rate per unit of power after taking into consideration the revenue from the water that is to be diverted. They have given us A. B. & C. proposals. In each case the rate is pointed out. The rates materially vary in proportion to the agreement that you are prepared to come to regarding the water. The rates are essentially dependent upon the amount of revenue derivable from the diversion of water and upon our willingness to credit the same either to the State or to the Company concerned, so much so that, before arriving at a decision as to the reasonableness of the rate concerned, we have necessarily to see how we stand to gain by the sale of water or what exactly will be the revenue we derive from it. Let us by all means ascertain the revenue from the water beforehand. That factor has also to be considered in fixing the terms with the Company. But I would go a step further. Let us also receive the investigation report which will disclose the cost of the scheme, and the cost per unit of power at the generating station. After knowing these, we will be in a better position to deal with the Company and settle the terms asked for by them. It was pointed out by Mr. Mammen Mappillai and one or two other members that the condition relating to the payment for water should be made a condition precedent to entering into any final agreement. I take it that this is included in the general resolution that I lay before this House.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: Are we bound to accept any one of these A. B. & C. proposals submitted by the Company?

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Yes, if it is decided that they are favourable terms. From the Press Communiqué, it is seen that these are the terms now considered to be favourable by Government as well, and according to the Law Member's exposition as to the cheapness of the rate, the terms offered are much more favourable than what might be offered by any other Company. But what I would urge is before this matter is decided one way or the other, let us have data to proceed upon, let us have an investigation as to the cost of the scheme, etc. So far as the official side is concerned, I must offer my thanks to Mr. K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, for his enunciation of certain principles of economic policy. I do not for a moment take exception to the principles

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

of economic policy enunciated by him. I am only thankful to him for brushing up my old lessons on the subject. I have to say this much more, and that is, that I have not forgotten one other lesson that I have learnt from him, *viz.*, that the natural resources of a country should be developed *by the State itself* whenever possible and to the advantage of the State only. He has also taught us that the development of Hydro-Electric Schemes of this nature means virtually the tapping of the natural resources and is a legitimate mode of increasing the revenue of the State, so much so that, if there is any possibility of taking up such schemes *by the State itself*, that will be the most proper thing to do. Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar proceeded on the assumption—and I must say he is not quite correct—that the present Kallar Scheme was *the* most promising one, and that there was one other site only of an equally promising nature, but that would benefit Cochin more than Travancore. It is seen from the Blue Book given to us that Mr. Jacob refers to six other sites equally promising. He characterises each of these as "this is one of the most promising sites." There are six other sites besides the Kallar and I would point out to the House that the note which he (Mr. Jacob) has added is not found printed in the file which was circulated yesterday. The note is very significant. It runs as follows:

"It should be noted that several of these projects have been to some extent investigated by the Madras Government with a view to extending their irrigation. Government would be well advised not to agree to any diversion of the water to the British boundary for any purpose until they are satisfied that the future hydro-electric development of Travancore territory will not thereby be impaired."

This was the note recorded by Mr. Jacob in 1919.

He investigated the Kallar Scheme two years after the Madras Government withdrew from the field, *i. e.*, after the Madras Government unsuccessfully put forward the explanation that the rainfall is low, and that the reduction in the flow of water is also small. One of the explanations offered by the Madras Government referred to the rainfall in the catchment area. They said that it was only 73 inches. In 1919, with reference to the Kallar project, Mr. Jacob said: "The rainfall of the place will average about 200-300 inches a year." But, all on a sudden, on the 5th December 1921, it came down to 95 inches.

We are now left to base our conclusions on the above figures which vary—and considerably vary—from time to time as occasion demands. The Government should decide only after due investigation of the objections once before raised by this Government and also after taking into consideration how the scheme would affect the material prosperity of the State to which Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar drew our particular attention. He rightly observed that we should not enter into any transaction which would hamper the material prosperity of the State. It is exactly that wording which is found in the letters from Mr. Rajagopalachari and Mr. Krishnan Nair with reference to the scheme when it was originally recommended to be dropped. One of these letters runs thus:

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai.]

"The discussion of the scheme ought not, however, the Darbar consider, to be narrowed down to the revenue aspect. The consequences of the scheme are more far-reaching and vital. They affect the material prosperity of the people of Travancore." (page 74 of the important papers.)

That is exactly my point. The objections now raised on the official side were all raised *to the same extent and in the same manner* by the Madras Government, *on more than three occasions*, and we were asked to reconsider the whole scheme in the light of the above. And on all those three occasions you find this Government reporting again and again that they have carefully and anxiously considered all these objections and explanations. They are not new to us. They have been fully considered, reconsidered and then rejected. No fresh grounds have now been urged by the official side, and yet we are unable to come to any agreement with regard to this matter. It is not, as stated by Dr. Kunjan Pillai, that we rely solely upon one particular letter from Mr. Bastow. The Press Communiqué itself clearly shows that the officers of the State were then consulted and that they were of opinion that the scheme was detrimental to the interests of the State. For instance, Mr. Bastow did not refer to the loss in the forest revenue in the catchment area. The scope of my Resolution has been misunderstood on the other side of the House.

From the long discussion we have had, the House is faced with two conflicting sets of facts which are absolutely irreconcilable with each other. In 1916 and before, there was a concensus of opinion among the officers of the State that the project would be highly detrimental to the interests of the State. There is now a consensus of opinion that it is eminently beneficial. Either the officers concerned in 1916 were too incompetent to recognise the advantages of the scheme or the present officers decline to look at the other side of the picture. Either way the task of this House appears to me to be quite clear. This House has now every reason to demand a thorough investigation into the whole matter before any further steps are taken in proceeding with the project. If the officers in 1916 expressed their opinions without sufficient data or investigation, the same defect applies to the officers who now advocate the contrary.

My main Resolution asks for nothing but a compromise. Let us not reject without sufficient reasons the opinion once recorded by this Government. At the same time, let us not decide against the scheme altogether before further scrutiny. But let us not bind ourselves to any terms *at this stage* until after we are able to see for ourselves how we stand to benefit by the scheme and how our interests will be affected by the said project. I need hardly remind my non-official colleagues that this is no question affecting any particular caste or community. It is a big national question and the bar of public opinion is eagerly awaiting how such a question will be disposed of by their representatives in this Council. I would only remind this side of the House of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

very grave warning that has been given to us by my revered Professor, Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar, *viz.*, that we are here to discharge a heavy responsibility as trustees of the people. And I would for the same reason ask this House to consider this question with the importance which it richly deserves.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: Mr. President, before I wind up the debate on this Resolution, by offering some remarks in reply to the observations which have been made to-night, I should like to be allowed to thank Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai, the mover of the resolution, not only for the forcible manner in which he has presented his case, but also for his cordially associating himself with the appeal I ventured to make to the House to look at the question dispassionately, and with a full recognition of the magnitude and gravity of the issues involved, and a due perception of the personal responsibility devolving upon every member to decide on these issues in such a way as to safeguard the best interests of the present generation and of future generations in the State. I trust it will be seen that the matter before the House is one of vital importance to the State—of "national" importance, to repeat an expression which has already been used in the debate. It is not a mere official or a non-official question, or one on which there can be any difference of interest between us. Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai has pointed out how our decision to-night is eagerly awaited by the big public outside, and how the merits of our findings will be widely and anxiously canvassed. May I add that it is not merely the members of the public, who are our contemporaries, but the great body of people who will form the generations of the future, the future public, who will have to pronounce on the wisdom of the decision we arrive at to-night? It is necessary that we should all realise this. For, as time and tide wait for no man, and the opportunity that we may reject to-day for the material development of the State may pass, and other such opportunities may not soon arise, it will be open to our posterity to say whether we did wisely, in *their* interests, as well as in ours, in giving such a chance the go-by. It cannot be denied that this will be the real effect of the acceptance of the motion before the House, whatever its mover and his supporters may say, and have said, in regard to the innocuousness of a "*little* delay", of the wisdom of moving *slowly*, and the advantages of having the question *re*-considered, on the lines indicated in the Resolution. Of this there can be no doubt at all. That is why I ventured to emphasise this important consequence of supporting the Resolution, even at the outset of my remarks, when I first spoke against the motion.

I trust, Sir, that the House will now allow me to offer a few remarks on some of the more important observations which have fallen in the course of the discussion, from either side of the House, and which appear to deserve the pointed consideration of the Council, when it proceeds to vote on the question. It is impossible for me, within the time available, to answer *all* the criticisms of the Kallar Scheme, major

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

and minor, which have been made, or to review to-night all the erroneous statements made by those who have opposed it. I submit that it is hardly necessary that, as the official spokesman, I should attempt all this, particularly after the forcible exposition of the relevant technical features of the scheme, by my expert colleagues on this side of the House, and after the illuminating information in regard to local conditions that some of the speakers from the other side of the House have been able to give us. Several of the statements which I could have challenged, had I the time, are again easily disproved by a simple reference to the printed papers which most of us have read and can peruse again. And, as my friend Mr. T. K. Velu Pillai observed, the main question has been getting more and more obscured in the discussion by the number of minor or irrelevant issues which have been raised, and over which the time of the House has been, to some extent, frittered away.

In taking this line, I do not wish to evade any really important or relevant objection to the scheme, which has been, or may conceivably be, suggested. Some minutes back, it was brought as a criticism—if not as a reproach—against me, as the official member in charge of the discussion, that I had not answered categorically, in my initial speech itself, the questions about the Kallar Scheme, which were said to have been put by Mr. G. Parameswaran Pillai. The criticism was made by my old friend, and former colleague, Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai, whom I have been particularly glad to see in this House, since it was my pleasure a long time back to serve with him as a teacher at the College, when he lectured on Malayalam to our students, unable to foresee the time when we should be in the same Council, as Professor and Ex-Professor members on opposite sides of the House! May I say, in reference to this charge, that neither the mover, nor Mr. Narayana Pillai, following him, apparently saw the need to put these questions? I took it that the learned mover, owing to the pressure for time in the debate—we have all been subject to this pressure—had refrained from doing so, tacitly assuming that it was unnecessary, since every one in the House must be so fully conversant with all matters of fact contained in the printed papers supplied to us recently, as to make any restatement or discussion of them superfluous. I was glad to follow his lead and restrict myself to those general aspects of the question at issue, which, from my position of comparative detachment, and which from their exhibiting certain economic features, appeared to deserve special treatment even in a *preliminary* speech, especially since I should be followed in the debate by expert colleagues who could deal, from such personal knowledge as no other members, on either side of the House, could lay any pretence even to equal, with the purely technical matters arising during the consideration of the scheme. I am glad I elected thus at the outset, to restrict myself, as far as possible, to the broad questions of economic policy which are involved in this scheme, and which

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

are in fact the most vital features of it, and on the soundness of which alone a proper justification of the Kallar Scheme would be possible. —I am happy that my friends, the mover and Mr. K. P. Raman Pillai, have been good enough to make explicit references to my observations on these general and economic aspects of the scheme, and to offer the assurance that they *accept* the force of my general observations. It is just on this welcome acceptance of my general economic position that I wish to rely largely to justify the scheme. It is not, I venture to think, necessary, or even advisable that, after the acceptance of my chief general positions, I should say anything which might after all prove either a mere recital of, or a needless commentary on, what has been already said by the Conservator of Forests, the Chief Engineer, the Director of Agriculture and the Law Member on matters appertaining to the forest, irrigational, agricultural and legal aspects of the propoposals under discussion. When on matters requiring for their *proper* elucidation an intimate personal knowledge of the entire catchment area of the Periyar, and of the Kallar, we have already had authoritative expressions of opinion from three such experts, possessing the required personal knowledge in so unique a degree, as Mr. Dhanukoti Pillai, Mr. Everard, and Dr. Kunjan Pillai have, the House will not surely require anything further either from me or from any others, on either side of the House, any more than it will need to be supplied bad law, in answer to the questions involving the legal aspects of the proposals—which have been raised by Mr. N. Padmanabha Pillai—after it has had the satisfying and pleasurable experience of dipping into our inexhaustible reservoir of legal knowledge—Mr. Subba Aiyar's—and coming out full and satisfied. I venture to think that a correct decision by the House has also been rendered easier, after the data furnished to it, from their wide personal knowledge, as much by non-official members like Mr. C. J. Kurien, Mr. A. Hoogewerf, Mr. Mammen Mappillai and Mr. K. Dominic Tomman, in regard to the possibilities of irrigation on the upper and lower Periyar, the nature of the lands in the Kallar basin, the probabilities of a diminution of flood level in the Periyar near Alwaye if the waters of the Kallar are subtracted from it, the consequential effects on the deposition of silt or destruction of cultivation (as the case may be) by the annual Periyar floods, the inrush of salt water to Alwaye and the diminished facilities for navigation of the lower reaches of the Periyar river if the Kallar's contribution to its volume of water be reduced, and similar questions raised in the discussion by those who have spoken in support of the Resolution, as by experts who happen also to be officials, like Dr. Kunjan Pillai, Mr. Everard and Mr. Dhanukoti Pillai. The Council must be under great obligations to these gentlemen, particularly to those non-officials, who, even at this late hour, have not been deterred from adding their personal testimony to those of the officials who have spoken, in order to demonstrate the thorough innocuousness of the Kallar Scheme, and the *utter baselessness* of the fears entertained of the prejudicial effects of the diversion of the water of the Kallar, both now and hereafter. The contribution to the discussion, made by such members, is quite in keeping with the very proper admission, from the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyengar.]

other side, of a point to which I took the liberty to invite attention—namely, that in this important matter the Government have absolutely no interest apart from the best interests of the people of the State, and that the aim on both sides of the House is identical, even though they may not always be able to see eye to eye with each other, on every point.

May I now turn, Sir, to some other points raised in the debate, which have not been disposed of by those who have preceded me in opposing the Resolution? At the outset, I have to correct, or to correct and supplement, *three* statements of importance, which have been made in the debate—two of them from my side.

In enforcing the argument that the proposed scheme will prove exceedingly beneficial to the State, and promote its rapid industrial development, by the supply of electrical energy at any station in Travancore, at rates far cheaper than those at which such energy is supplied elsewhere, *and is still found profitable for industrial use*, my learned friend Mr. Subba Aiyar has stated that the cost of electrical energy at Trivandrum, may be about 2 annas. per T. U. and it has been suggested that it will be over one anna per unit at Alleppey. Even at the rates mentioned, the supply will be so cheap that, following the well-known principle of *industries seeking cheap power*, we can confidently anticipate an era of early industrial expansion in our State. But the actual rates may be lower even than these, on the reckoning suggested by the last cablegram from Messrs. Dickinson & Co. to be found on page 53 of the printed papers. For, there it is stated that for a distance of 60 miles (which brings you nearer Alleppey than Kottayam) the extra cost is only ·5 of an anna. On the same reckoning the cost at Trivandrum should be *less* than 1½ annas per unit.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I wish to point to the official member that the previous correspondence shows that the Company offered to supply the energy at 4½ pies per unit at a receiving station 50 miles off from the generating station.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: My recollection is that the offer of 4½ pies per unit was only if the full load was taken, and if the cost of transmission lines and transformers was to be ours. However, the quotations now made are the latest, and represent those which the Company may be willing to *guarantee*, if all the expenditure on transmission was its. The difference between what is stated to have been offered and what is now offered, however, is not so important, when it is recognised that the latest offer still gives us a very much better thing in the way of cheap energy, than any that we have had yet, taking into consideration the differential rates referred to by the learned Law Member. This, I submit, is a very important advantage, which should commend the scheme to every one—who has seen what a transformation cheap electricity can effect, and has effected, in a country like Mysore, and on the character of its people, who have become more self-reliant, energetic, alert and business-like than in the pre-Sivasamudram power days.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

The next point to which I must refer relates to the possible reduction of the level of water in the Periyar, if the Kallar water is to be utilised, *as proposed*. It has been argued that the level of water in the Periyar will *not* be materially diminished. It has also been argued that a diminution of the water level, particularly in the flood season, will be positively a *boon* to those whose lands lie on the banks of the Periyar, and, that, therefore, the present scheme cannot be opposed, as it will reduce the flood level on the Periyar near Alwaye. May I say that, while it may be valid to argue in *either* way, and while both statements have undoubtedly elements of truth, it is hardly justifiable *to urge both the pleas in favour of the scheme simultaneously*? I do not propose to do so. My position is that the reduction in the flood level of the Periyar, consequent on the diversion of the Kallar water, will be so small as to be imperceptible, a matter of a half or a third of an inch, as explained by Mr. Everard. I understand that the floods which deposit silt when they overflow the banks are to be counted, not by *inches*, but by *feet*. To those, therefore, who would seek for relief from such floods (on the ground of their *injuriousness*), when the Kallar water is diverted, this should bring little satisfaction. If any such relief is to be gained, it must be from some new irrigation project, in the lower reaches of the Periyar, that would carry off a larger proportion of its flood, than the mere diversion of the Kallar can effect.

In respect of the alleged diminution of the Periyar water, that must, it is argued, follow from the utilisation of the Kallar under the present scheme. I should like to place before the House the results of calculations contained in a paper which was given to me to-day by an expert Engineer, who knows the whole area concerned and has given both time and thought to the consideration of this question, and who has not hitherto been committed to one side or the other in this controversy. He points out that the present Kallar Scheme provides for drawing off only 200 *cusecs*, whereas its predecessors reckoned on drawing off the whole of the 440 *cusecs* from the river. "Assuming this will be continuous throughout the year, it works out only to about 35 per cent. of the run off from the catchment of 73 square miles, proposed to be intercepted, and to only 2·6 per cent. on the total flow into the river from the whole of its catchment of 1670 square miles, excluding that drawn off into the British territory, from the Periyar lake." The same expert also points out that by opening sluices in the proposed dam over the Kallar, and through the escapes in the dam, the surplus water of the river not utilised by the Power Works will run off into the catchment area. In this view, therefore, the diversion of water will reduce the level of the Periyar flood even by *less* than the imperceptible height, in *fractions* of an inch, mentioned by our Chief Engineer.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: May I know who the gentleman is?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: Mr. Natesa Aiyar, Senior Executive Engineer, now in charge of the Maramat Department, who has obviously no axe to grind in

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

giving this opinion. When I am on this subject, to which so much importance has been attached by every one, who has hitherto opposed the scheme, and which appears to form the sheet anchor for the Resolution before us, I should like to tell the House that, with a desire to get at the real feeling among experts in this matter, I have been enquiring of other officers also whose knowledge and position should entitle their opinions being received with respect. Mr. Dhanukoti Pillai and Dr. Kunjan Pillai, whom I had questioned, have already told you what they told me. Another officer, who is high up in our Public Works Department and who was long in charge of the area in question, —(A cry: 'Who is he?')—Mr. O. S. Ramaswami Aiyar, B. A., B. E., Executive Engineer, has not only confirmed the other opinion that I have already placed before you, but suggested another point which the House may well consider. This relates to the vertical nature of the sides of the valley of the Periyar—the absence of gradual slopes—which makes it improbable that a *small* difference in the height of the flood *can* cause or retard inundation over the banks, as suggested in the letter of Mr. Bastow to which the learned mover and some of his supporters made frequent reference.

On the question of the relative advantages of using the water of the Kallar for power and for irrigation, again, my enquiries are equally conclusive. I am *definitely* assured that there are *no* proposals at present to use the water of the Periyar for irrigation, and that the prospects of future irrigational development in the area are *remote*. I am also assured that, even if such a scheme is started, there will be sufficient water in the Periyar, after the diversion of the Kallar water, to be utilised for such a project. It is thus quite clear that there is no possible conflict, as so freely suggested in the entire course of the debate, between the irrigational and power-generating ideas.

The third point to which I must refer is the skilful use which the learned mover made of the apparently conflicting rainfall figures quoted by Mr. Jacob, figures which appeared to be 99·5 inches per year for the Kallar area in 1921, and to have been taken as 200 to 300 inches in September, 1919. Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai's point apparently is that there is no relying on such conflicting figures, and that there is thus a case made out for further enquiry. May I point out that the earlier figures for rainfall are based on surmise, while the later represent, if I recollect correctly, the *average* for the *six* monsoon months, and for *eleven* rain-gauge stations? In any case, I must point out that, inasmuch as the percentage of the flood is calculated only on the *lower* figure—which, if it errs at all, errs only on the side of moderation,—the acceptance of a *higher* figure as the annual rainfall for the area can only show the percentage of reduction in flood to be *still lower* than it was found by Mr. Jacob to be. This would, I affirm, strengthen *my* case, rather than the learned mover's!

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Again, it has been argued, on the other side, that the electric scheme is wholly or partly a blind, and that the real object is to confer a benefit on British India, by giving our water away for use in irrigation in Madura district. For this argument, it has been repeatedly stated that the present proposal is exactly the same as the one refused *thrice* by our State when it was put forward by the British Government, and that it is the identical thing condemned by Mr. Bastow. I must request a reference to the entire printed correspondence to demonstrate how *wholly untenable* these assumptions are. Let us go into the past history of the negotiations, which run back to 1909. The first proposal of the British Government was for a pure irrigation scheme, like the Periyar Scheme, with *all* its implications. Then, that Government found that it would not be worth while to spend so much on it, and suggested that the Kallar should be utilised to form a compensating reservoir to the Periyar lake. Lastly, there came Mr. Tressler's scheme for developing electric power from the Periyar dam, and for this, it was necessary to ensure a constant high level of water in the Periyar reservoir, in the seasons of maximum demand in it. The Kallar was to be utilised to release the strain on the Periyar. These were the three successive proposals, and *not one of them is identical with that which we are considering*. What was Mr. Bastows' opinion, which has been repeatedly quoted against us?. *Did* he really condemn any power-scheme from the Kallar, or did he only condemn a power-scheme from the Kallar which *our* State was *not* promoting? The papers will show, what I have already maintained before the Council, that Mr. Bastow's position is emphatically an implication in favour of such a scheme—developed for, and under the sanction of our State, as the one we are considering undoubtedly is.

I wish to say that the strong language of Mr. Bastow's letter is easily comprehended, if the history of the Periyar question is recalled. The iron had been burnt into us, over what we lost in the latter. And, I may say that it is this feeling which seems to underlie an objection made to-day, that we may practically lose 73 square miles of territory if the Kallar Scheme is sanctioned. I emphatically say, we shall *not*. It has been asked whether we shall be allowed to exploit our forest in the catchment and we have been told in reply—we can read it in the correspondence—that we shall. We shall be able to grow forests, *if possible*, over the area. The Company are *our* concessionaries. There won't be any loss of territory or jurisdiction. We have all this—which we did not quite get in the Periyar, and we shall also have a much-needed and expensive hill-road.

It is natural that the burnt child should dread the fire. In the present case, I can claim that the lessons of the Periyar controversy have *not* been lost, and that the negotiations and the terms, disclosed by the printed papers, reveal not the haste of our Government, but their great vigilance—their great caution. I should like to ask the learned members on the other side, which of them, acting on behalf of a client, can have been more thoroughly vigilant in this matter

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

than our Government has been? There is no likelihood, in any case, of any forgetfulness hereafter, for the force of the expression of opinion on this aspect in this Council cannot be lost on the Government. It is most unfortunate that, in straining to make a case for an alleged inequality of status and power between our State and British India, in the completion of these negotiations, an attempt should have been made by Mr. K. Paramesvaran Pillai to put such an interpretation on the courteous expressions in the concluding portions of Dewan Mr. Krishnan Nair's letters, as they will obviously not bear! (*vide* pages 62 and 74 of the printed papers.) Is this really what it has been represented by Mr. K. Paramesvaran Pillai as being—a kind of petition, from an inferior to a superior—and not the common form of courteous expression, characterisitic of the urbanity which we have always been accustomed to associate with our late Dewan?

There are one or two other misapprehensions among non-official members which must be removed. One is that Government are already so fully committed in regard to the details of the scheme, that it will not be possible to alter them hereafter. This is *not* so. I have authority to state to the Council that the terms that are set forth in the Communiqué are not in any sense absolutely final, and that if Government see the necessity to modify them in any manner, the change *will* be made. And what has taken place in the Council to-night will not be forgotten when this is done.

Secondly, there is the apprehension that if the Resolution is rejected, Government will drop all further examination of the scheme and its details. This fear, again, is groundless. It is one of the advantages of this Council, that our President happens to be also the Head of the Administration. The discussions that have taken place in this Council cannot lose their just weight with the Government, under any conditions. A further assurance on this matter seems therefore hardly necessary. Nevertheless, I am to give the assurance to the House that, if, on further inquiry, further re-examination of the matter by themselves, and any further investigation of it that Government might undertake, with all the assistance they are able to get from officials and non-officials, the Government are satisfied that modifications in details, to which reference has been made in the debate, are desirable, such modifications will certainly be made.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Will the official member please explain what he means by investigation?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: It means that the Government will not pass final orders before considering all the details of the question. That is all. I can give the assurance that if the Government think it necessary to alter the terms in respect of some details, they will not hesitate to make the changes.

In regard to the rate of compensation for our water when it is let into the British territory, on which some emphasis was laid, and the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

determination of which, it was urged on the other side, should *precede* any final orders on the scheme,—

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: What objection is there in delaying the grant of the concession till the Government finally hear from the British Government about the rates which they are prepared to give?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: I am afraid I cannot answer, on behalf of the Government, a question of this nature sprung upon me without notice. I was about to say, when I was interrupted, and would now proceed to say that the Government expect that they could claim and would receive the *full net* revenue of the additional area in British India, which will be irrigated by the water discharged from the tail race.

In regard to another point, which has been suggested by Mr. N. Padmanabha Pillai, *viz.*, that we should see that the Company is not permitted to obtain the concession, and then barter it away to some one else, leaving us to fight out the question, and that they should not be permitted to discriminate against us by offering lower rates than those charged to us, for electric power sold in British India, I am authorised to say that the Government will take care, when final orders are passed, that the Company will not be allowed to sell the power to others at cheaper rates, and to establish unfair discrimination against Travancore consumers, or to transfer to others their concessions, without the sanction of Government.

These are the three matters of constructive criticism, which have been placed before the House to-night, and on which some emphasis has been laid in order to show that the scheme should not be persisted in, unless the questions raised were first satisfactorily dealt with. I trust the House will agree that it has reason to be satisfied with the assurances in regard to these, which I have been able to give on behalf of the Government.

I should like now to turn to the Resolution itself, in order to show to you how the Council will be stultifying itself by voting for it. Much capital has been made by my learned friends, on the other side, of the disagreement between engineer and engineer as justifying the call for such a further investigation, as has been recommended by the mover in paragraphs (*b*) and (*c*) of the Resolution. I wish to submit to the House that the fundamental questions at issue, in this controversy, are not *engineering* questions. The Resolution itself recognises this. The consideration of such questions as the manner in which the interests of Travancore will be affected by the generation of power on the other side of the Ghats, and the terms that may be granted to the concessionaries, are subjects in which a common-sense judgment is possible, and it is as open to this Council, composed of laymen like me or Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai, to pronounce as validly as a Council of Engineers. Let us not, therefore, be led away by the eloquent pleas of the learned mover for further vague investigation, by bodies of mixed experts. May I go one step further, and ask: "What precisely is the sort of expert opinion that

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[RAO BAHADUR K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai and all his friends have been asking for?" There did not seem to be any harmony between their views as to who their experts were to be. May I point out to the House that it is being called upon to vote upon a *definite* proposition, in a *definite* form of words, and not upon vague suggestions and sentiments, such as it has been treated to from my friends on the other side.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: By "experts" I mean men like the Chief Engineer and the Director of Agriculture. They may be asked to investigate, since they have not investigated the matter before coming forward with their explanations in this House.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: I am glad of the explanation of the mover, because it proves *my* point that there is wide disparity between Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai's explanation and the terms of his Resolution. Apart from the questions of principle involved in it, the Resolution is so badly and loosely worded that, on that ground alone, if there were no other, the Council should reject the motion at once.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: The member ought to have taken the objection in time.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: I am entitled to do so at any time. The Resolution has been drafted by lawyers, who are accustomed to precision of expression. I am entitled, on behalf of the House, to complain that there should be consistency between carefully drawn up Resolutions and the urbane explanations which are offered by their author to explain away features in the Resolution that are obviously open to criticism. I am entitled to say that members who make themselves responsible for such Resolutions, and who have prepared the subject with such thoroughness of detail, for the purpose of moving a Resolution *criticising* the action of Government, have no reason to complain if they have to face the natural retort. We have been told of 'experts'. Who are these? If *engineers*, why a *Committee* of experts, as suggested in clause (*b*)? Does Mr. Everrard, whose investigation will *now* satisfy Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai, constitute a Committee? Or, are we to pay for *several* expert engineers? And, if we engage them, *can* they tell us more than our engineers have already done?

If the Committee is to consist of laymen, why style them 'experts'? What is the justification for the implication, in the Resolution, of either ignorance of those who have reported so far, or of their want of disinterestedness? There are only two conceivable uses of the water of the Kallar—irrigation and the generation of power. Surely, the *same* Committee cannot report on *both* questions, and we shall require *two* Committees. Again, the investigation of the manner in which the interests of Travancore will be affected, in *either* way, is

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

an *economic*, not an *engineering* question. Thus, if the Resolution is to be taken, *as it stands*, it means either *three* Committees of 'experts', or it means a *mixed* Committee of experts in irrigation, in hydro-electric schemes, in economic development, in commerce, and in high finance! Assume that all these experts form one Committee. How will their differences be settled, when an 'expert' in one branch traverses the opinions of the experts in another? I am afraid the thing reduces itself either to an absurdity or to a replica of our Economic Development Board, where this question was discussed, fully and freely, and before which the mover and his friends had ample opportunity to come forward and state their case.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: And we did.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: If that be so, why ask for another body of the same type?

Sir, I am afraid the House must see now what it will be committing itself to by endorsing the Resolution.

There is only one point more, Sir, which I have to answer before I close, and that is an important point. Almost everyone of our critics has asked: "What harm can happen by *delaying* the settlement of the matter?" I shall reply by a reference to the opinion of Mr. John Kurien on this question. I do so, because, in our discussions, both here and outside, so much emphasis has been laid on Mr. Kurien's being supposed to be against the scheme. Read page 49 of the printed papers, paragraph 16. You will find there that Mr. John Kurien said that "there was great "danger in postponing the investigations of the Kallar Scheme, because "the neighbouring State of Cochin had under contemplation a Hydro-"Electric Scheme of their own, and unless we were first in the field, it "would not be possible for us to find a market for our electrical power." And, the other speakers who followed him developed the same idea of the danger of delay. The House will remember that *I* emphasised this aspect, even when I *first* spoke on this question. I may now refer to other arguments in support of my position. If we allow this matter to lie over, the Company will probably drop it, and go elsewhere for similar opportunities, and they might also say that we cannot be trusted to deal squarely. There is a further point, and one of even greater importance. I want the House to understand that I am not putting it forward *now*, for the *first* time, to strengthen the *present* case. I raised it years ago, long before the present scheme was thought of, elsewhere, and in a conference of economists which I attended. It refers to the availability of capital. The enormous wastage of the world-war has left behind it an unparalleled demand *everywhere* for capital to rebuild a wrecked world. Every country is full of schemes of development for which capital is sought. Those schemes, which are fortunate in securing *early* capital, start with the best chance. As the world settles down, this type of demand for capital will increase. Five years hence, for example, capital *may* still be had; but, with such a persistent and growing demand, it can be had only at a higher price than we may now have

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. P. Raman Pillai.]

to pay for loan capital. For, paradoxical as it may seem, the rate of interest has gone up and will go up, after the termination of the war and as the war-weary world settles down. I say, therefore, that, should we lose the opportunity we now have of securing the considerable financial backing that will be needed to launch the scheme, we may not find the same backing as easily or with as little sacrifice, some years hence, when we are ready.

Sir, before the discussion is wound up, I wish to be allowed to make again a very strong personal appeal to the members of this House to bestow their most serious thought on this matter before they vote on the Resolution. I want members to realise that the advantages of the scheme are so clear, that it would be repeating many speeches to retail them again. We have seen that the alleged disadvantages do not exist. The scheme requires a very large sum of money such as the State cannot well raise. If we have to raise this sum, we must create the best impression on the money market. Are we likely to do this by voting for this Resolution? With all the earnestness and sincerity in my power, I wish to submit to the House that I am as deeply interested in the proper realisation of the scheme, as any born Travancorean can be. I am not privileged to class myself as a born Travancorean, but, my friends on the other side will, I trust, grant that I have lived sufficiently long in the country, which I have made my home for over twenty years, and in which I have earned many friendships and reaped so many kindnesses, that I identify myself unconsciously only with the best interests of the State, both now and hereafter. May I also say that I have not spoken merely as a Government servant, but that whatever I have said has been uttered with a degree of conviction, which I would ask you to believe to be most intense and most sincere. I have urged the rejection of the Resolution because it stands in the way of the *early* materialisation of the scheme of development which, along with many others, I so ardently desire for our State. Let the House remember what even a *temporary* delay would mean. The investigation can take place only between January and June in the non-rainy season. A delay now will therefore mean at least nine months more. Secondly, recollect the terms of the Resolution before you, its *general* and vague character, and the serious difficulties in which you will be landed, in interpreting it. If we adjourn the scheme, do we drop it? If we take it up later, when do we see the end of it in this Council? These are practical difficulties, which the House *must* consider, and I should be failing in my duty if I did not sound a grave warning, to the members, of the consequences of hasty or wrong decisions on this question. I trust, Sir, that nothing more is needed from me, to strengthen my appeal to the House to reject Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai's Resolution, both on the ground of the form in which it is couched and on the merits of the big questions in issue.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: Now, Sir, you may have noted that the official member in charge of the Resolution has not been able

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

to give the particular information I asked for. May I request you, Sir, to be good enough to furnish that information, *viz.*, whether the Government have any objection to delay granting the concession till they hear from the Madras Government about the rates?

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, as President I have the privilege of addressing the Council before putting a motion to the vote. But I do not propose to speak on the merits of the motion now before the House, as I do not wish to prejudice the House one way or the other. I think, however, that I shall be failing in my duty, if I do not say a few words to remove any misapprehension that may have been created by two utterances made in the course of the discussion. I feel it my duty in fairness to the Madras Government to make a statement. It has been said that this electric scheme is merely a pretext on the part of the British Government. What is meant is that it is intended for the development of an irrigation scheme in British India. The second statement made is that the Travancore Government and the Madras Government cannot be called equal partners, but they will, or can, only be inferior and superior partners. I wish to enter a very strong protest against and also contradict what is implied in these two statements. There is absolutely no foundation for thinking that this is a pretext on the part of the Madras Government to obtain our water. It is true that once the Madras Government wanted to get our water, but the idea was given up. There was no manner of approach on the part of the Madras Government to obtain this water again, and it is this Government that, as a result of the Conference that was held in November last, approached the Madras Government and moved the subject once again. In regard to the negotiation and in regard to the relative position of the two parties—the Madras Government and the Travancore Government—all that I can say to the House is that they will be perfectly equal partners. (*Hear, hear.*) There is absolutely no inferiority or superiority, and I may assure you that the language in the concluding portion of Mr. Krishnan Nair's letter, to which Mr. Changanachery K. Parameswaran Pillai alluded, was one of inter-Statal courtesy and not language which, in any real sense, reflected the relations between the Governments. I am confident that this Government will do nothing to militate against the negotiations as between two equal partners. This is what I want to tell the House.

In regard to Mr. Raman Pillai's request for information, that is a matter in which I do not think that I should commit myself or give an immediate answer. It is a matter which will be considered very carefully. I now proceed to put the Resolution to the vote of the Council.

The question is that clause (*a*) of the Resolution, as amended, reproduced below, be adopted:

"That this Council recommends to Government that, in regard to the Kallar Hydro-Electric Scheme now under the consideration of Government, no assurance should be held out to Messrs. Alfred Dickinson & Co. that they will be granted such permission, facilities and concessions as have been prayed for by them to construct and carry out the scheme until the Council have had an opportunity of examining the report of any

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[The President.]

preliminary investigation that the Company may be permitted to undertake in this behalf and of ascertaining in what way and to what extent the State stood to benefit by the said project."

The motion was negatived.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I ask for a division.

PRESIDENT: The Council will now divide.

The Council divided as follows:

AYES—21

Mr. S. Adam Sait.	Mr. N. Padmanabha Pillai.
,, T. M. Chidambaratanu Pillai.	,, Joseph Panjikaran.
,, A. Govinda Menon.	,, G. Paramesvaran Pillai.
,, C. P. Kochukunju Pillai.	,, K. Paramesvaran Pillai.
,, S. Krishna Aiyar.	,, N. Ramakrishna Pillai.
,, N. Kumaran.	,, K. P. Raman Pillai.
,, T. Kumara Pillai.	,, V. Raman Pillai.
,, V. Kunjukrishna Pillai.	,, Dominic Tomman.
,, M. R. Madhava Variar.	,, Trivikaramar Vasudevar.
,, P. K. Narayana Pillai.	,, T. K. Velu Pillai.
,, M. Nilakanda Pillai.	

NOES—28

Mr. K. Anantanarayana Aiyar.	Dewan Bahadur Dr. P. N. Lakshmanan.
,, I. C. Chacko.	Mr. John Mackie.
,, Paul V. Daniel.	,, K. C. Mammen Mappillai.
,, R. Dhanukoti Pillai.	,, J. John Nidiry.
,, R. Everard.	,, S. Paramesvara Aiyar.
,, K. George.	,, P. Paramesvaran.
,, L. C. Hodgson.	,, W. H. Pitt.
,, A. Hoogewerf	,, K. C. Raja Raja Varma.
Rao Bahadur K. A. Krishna Aiyangar.	,, M. Raja Raja Varma.
Mr. R. Krishna Pillai.	,, C. Raman Kunju.
Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai.	Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.
Mr. Tariatu Kunjitomman.	Mr. V. Subba Aiyar.
The Rev. Fr. Kuriakose Vettikkapalli.	,, A. J. Van Ross.
Mr. C. J. Kurien.	President.

PRESIDENT: I will now put clause (*b*):

"That a Committee of experts be appointed to investigate the possibility of Kallar water being made use of for irrigational and other purposes in Travancore and as to how the proposed diversion of Kallar water and the generation of power in the Madura District will affect the interests of Travancore."

The motion was negatived.

PRESIDENT: Does Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai press for a division?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I want a division.

The Council then divided as follows:

AYES—20

Mr. S. Adam Sait.
,, T. M. Chidambaratanu Pillai.
,, A. Govinda Menon.
,, C. P. Kochukunju Pillai.
,, S. Krishna Aiyar.
,, N. Kumaran.
,, T. Kumara Pillai.
,, V. Kunjukrishna Pillai.
,, T. Lakshmana Pillai.
,, M. R. Madhava Variar.
Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai
,, M. Nilakanda Pillai
,, Joseph Panjikaran
,, G. Paramesvaran Pillai.
,, K. Paramesvaran Pillai.
,, N. Ramakrishna Pillai.
,, K. P. Raman Pillai.
,, V. Raman Pillai.
,, Dominic Tomman.
,, T. K. Velu Pillai.

NOES—28

Mr. K. Anantanarayana Aiyar.
,, I. C. Chacko.
,, Paul V. Daniel.
,, R. Dhanukoti Pillai.
,, R. Everard.
,, K. George.
,, L. C. Hodgson.
,, A. Hoogewerf.
Rao Bahadur K. A. Krishna Aiyangar.
Mr. R. Krishna Pillai.
Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai.
Mr. Tariatu Kunjitomman.
The Rev. Fr. Kuriakose Vettikkapalli.
Mr. C. J. Kurien.
Dewan Bahadur Dr. P. N. Lakshmanan.
Mr. John Mackie.
,, K. C. Mammen Mappillai.
,, J. John Nidiri.
,, S. Paramesvara Aiyar.
,, P. Paramesvaran.
,, W. H. Pitt.
,, K. C. Raja Raja Varma.
,, M. Raja Raja Varma.
,, C. Raman Kunju.
Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.
Mr. V. Subba Aiyar.
,, A. J. Van Ross.
President.

Clause (*c*) of the Resolution being consequential upon clause (*b*) was withdrawn with the leave of the House.

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, the business of the day is now over and the Council stands adjourned to Monday, the 24th July.

The Council adjourned at 7-40 P. M. to meet again on Monday, the 24th July, 1922, at 11-30 A. M.

S. PARAMESVARA AIYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly